TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES BOARD MEETING

Friday, May 29, 2015

Lone Star Room
Building 1
4000 Jackson Avenue
Austin, Texas

BOARD MEMBERS:

Johnny Walker, Chair
Laura Ryan, Vice-Chair
Robert "Barney" Barnwell, III
Luanne Caraway
Blake Ingram
Raymond Palacios
Victor Rodriguez
Marvin Rush
Joseph Slovacek

I N D E X

<u>AGEN</u>	DA ITI	EM		PAGE
1.	A. B.	Publi Commo Chai: Exec	Call and Establishment of Quorum ic Comment ents and Announcements from rman and Board Members and utive Director Quarterly Performance Measures	4 none 6 7
2.	EXECI	TTTVE.	SESSION	143
۷.		OIIVI	BLOSION	115
3.	ACTI	ITI NC	EMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION	none
4.	REPOI A.	_	nce & Audit Finance a. Quarterly Financial Report b. Legislative Appropriations Reques	8 t 20
		2.	 Internal Audit Division Status a. Internal Audit Division Status Report - May 2015 b. Results of Internal Audit Divisi Peer Review and Quality Assurance and Improvement Program 	
		В.	Legislative & Public Affairs: 84th Legislative Session 1. Agency Priority Bills 2. High Impact Bills 3. Specialty License Plate Bills	32
		С.	Projects & Operations 1. Enterprise Projects Quarterly Report 2. Headquarters Facilities 3. Deputy and Fee Rule Update	135 133 131
5.		IBLE Z Texa: Repo: Vehi	, DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION s Transportation Institute (TTI) rt: "Estimating the Cost to Process cle Registration and Title Transaction exas Counties"	45 .s

	В.	Licensing, Administration, Consumer Affairs and Enforcement (LACE) Replacement Project Contracts
	С.	Commercial Property Lease Renewal for 146 Waco Regional Service Center
	D.	Security Services Contract for Regional 148 Service Centers
	E.	Specialty Plate Design 128 • World Wildlife Fund - Vendor Plate (Redesign)
6.	RESO	LUTIONS for INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION - RULES Adoption of Rules under Title 43, Texas Administrative Code 1. Chapter 206, Management 124 a. Rule Review, Government Code, §2001.039 Proposal Published March 6, 2015 - 40 Tex Reg 1111) b. Repeals/Amendments (Proposal Published March 6, 2015 - 40 Tex Reg 1019)
		2. Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and 126 Registration Section 217.27 - Vehicle Registration Insignia (Proposal Published April 3, 2015 - 40 Tex Reg 1963)
		3. Chapter 219, Oversize and Overweight 129 Vehicles and Loads Subchapters A - F and H - Amendments (Proposal Published March 6, 2015 - 40 Tex Reg 1026)
	В.	Proposal of Rules under Title 43, Texas Administrative Code 1. Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle 103 Distribution a. Rule Review, Government Code, §2001.039 b. Repeals/Amendments
		2. Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and 119 Registration New Section 217.193, Delegation of Final Order Authority
7.	ADJO	URNMENT 153

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WALKER: Good morning. My name is Johnny

Walker. I'm pleased to open this Board meeting of the

Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. It is now 8:08, and I

now call this Board meeting of May 29, 2015 to order.

I want to note for the record that public notice of this meeting, containing all items on the agenda, was filed with the Office of Secretary of State on May 21, 2015.

Before we begin today's meeting, please place all cell phones and other communication devices in the silent mode.

If you wish to address the Board during today's meeting, please complete a speaker's sheet at the registration table. To comment on an agenda item, please complete a yellow sheet, identify the agenda item that you would like to speak on. If it is not an agenda item, we will take up your comments during the public portion of this meeting.

Now I'd like to have a roll call of the board members. Vice Chairman Ryan?

(No response.)

MR. WALKER: Board Member Barnwell?

MR. BARNWELL: Present.

MR. WALKER: Board Member Caraway?

(512) 450-0342

ON THE RECORD REPORTING

1	MS. CARAWAY: Here.
2	MR. WALKER: Board Member Ingram?
3	MR. INGRAM: Here.
4	MR. WALKER: Board Member Palacios?
5	(No response.)
6	MR. WALKER: Board Member Rodriguez?
7	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Present.
8	MR. WALKER: Board Member Rush?
9	(No response.)
10	MR. WALKER: Board Member Slovacek?
11	MR. SLOVACEK: Here.
12	MR. WALKER: Let the record reflect that I,
13	Johnny Walker, am here and we do have a quorum. Let the
14	record reflect also that Vice Chairman Ryan and Board
15	Member Palacios are absent. I think that Mr. Rush, he
16	told me yesterday he will be here, so he may straggle in
17	here. He's 20 blocks away. Thank you. So I'll kind of
18	stall up here for a few minutes and cover some other
19	business.
20	Before I go forward, I'd like to make a couple
21	of comments. Vice Chairman Ryan had a doctor's
22	appointment today and she's going to have some surgery
23	done next week, it's serious but it's not that serious, I
24	guess, and so I would like to ask that everybody please

remember her in your prayers. I think next Thursday is

when she's having her surgery. I know that she wanted to be here. She is a very active member of the board and she works harder probably than anybody on the board, I think. She's constantly calling me and I know she calls our staff. So keep her in your prayers and thoughts next week.

2.5

Okay. If no comments, do we have any comments? We do to a specific item?

Okay. Let's move to agenda item 1.C, comments, announcements from the chairman, board members and executive director. First off, let's go to Whitney and let her give us an update on our performance metrics.

MS. BREWSTER: Thank you. For the record, my name is Whitney Brewster, executive director. I am providing the board with my executive report of the agency's key performance measures. This is the first time the agency has reported on the new key performance measures by quarter, and we are hoping that over time this will better show the agency trends in performance versus what you've been seeing are month to month.

Reflected in your board books you will find the executive dashboard for the first quarter, January through March of 2015. The agency has set some pretty aggressive goals for our priority measures and I think you'll see that reflected in the overall dashboard. On each of the

agency's goals we are in yellow, and also something to note is that during this time frame the agency had some pretty significant initiatives on its plate. Just to mention a few, single sticker, RTS refactoring, WebDealer, CAPPS financial and CAPPS HR, regional office communication and HQ call center projects, and a legislative session. So these are just a few of the things that have been going on within the agency that you may see reflected in our key performance measures.

I am hopeful that as we move forward and as we level set a little bit from all these major initiatives that we will see vast improvement in those measures. You will see the second quarter key performance indicator dashboard at the August board meeting.

And with that, I'll conclude my remarks and answer any questions that the board may have.

MR. WALKER: Anybody have any comments or questions of Whitney about the performance of the agency?

(No response.)

MR. WALKER: Okay. I wanted to recognize a couple of people here today for service years. We have Daniel Avitia, Caroline Love. Is Caroline here? I thought she lived at the Capitol. Are we still not working over there? Sandra Vice. I think that you are coming on your one year anniversary with us. We want to

thank you for the outstanding job that you're doing, and glad to have you all, so keep up the good work.

(Applause.)

MR. WALKER: I don't know what Caroline is going to do after the session shuts down here in about a week because she'll be lost. She spends like 24 hours a day over there in that building, walking the halls, and I know she does because I get enough calls that she's over there, people are telling me: I saw her walking down the hall. I think she knows every one of those guys over there on a first name basis, or at least their staff.

Let's go to Linda Flores and we'll do our quarterly financial report right now.

Before we go, I made a mistake, and I know that they have all been with the agency for about a year, except for Sandra, I think she's been here for two years, but Daniel has been with the state now for 20 years, Sandra has been also with the state for 20 years -- that's pretty amazing, she doesn't even look like she's 20 years old -- and Caroline has been with the state for 10 years.

Linda, are you ready?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. For the record, my name is Linda Flores, I'm the chief financial officer for the agency, and with me is Renita Bankhead, assistant CFO, and we're here to provide an update on the agency's

performance for the second quarter ending February 28, 2015, and with that, I'll turn it over to Ms. Bankhead.

In your board documents you're going to see the revenues collected by the agency year to date. We are continuing to see an increase in our collections over the same period last year, and we're still seeing a consistent trend that we've seen in the past. We're seeing more cars being registered, oversize/overweight permitting is still up, and we're also seeing some additional fees due to dealer license and commercial transportation revenues.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: What's the percentage?

MS. FLORES: The increase is 8.7 percent over the same time last year.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: What figure are we using for projections?

MS. FLORES: We are using these -- each fee has its own projection, for registration we're assuming a 2 percent growth rate into the next year for '16 and '17.

MR. WALKER: So Linda, do we project in our fiscal budget some anticipated growth, and this is in excess of that anticipated growth, or is that just over prior years?

MS. FLORES: It's over prior years' expenditures. We're meeting our projections that we provide to the Comptroller's Office every biennium, so

we're pretty much on target.

2.5

MR. WALKER: So are our projections pretty close to the actual numbers then?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.

The one thing on revenues that I'd like to point out, and this is something new, but we are tracking, on page 8 of your board documents, the My Plates contract. As you all know, we revised the second five-year term of the contract so that the business model is different from the first five-year contract. This contract has a provision where the vendor, My Plates, is focused on new sales of new plates as opposed to getting a larger share of renewals, and in this contract the state is receiving a larger share of the renewals on their specialty plates.

Under the first five-year term, My Plates did meet their \$25 million obligation to the State of Texas. At the end of the contract they had reached \$27.3 million and that was through November 2014. We will continue to see the revenue collections and make sure that they're able to meet their new obligation to the state, but so far they're tracking well. For the first few months, three months, they've generated \$2.2 million for the state; in the month of March -- which is not in your board books -- there was another \$700,000 revenue collected.

MR. WALKER: So for the first two months it's

\$2.2 million?

2.5

MS. FLORES: For the first three months under the new contract.

We're not trying to do any projections at this time simply because we don't have enough information data points to really track how they're doing because of the new business model that they're working under. But we'll continue to monitor them throughout just to make sure that they are on track.

And with that, we'll turn to expenditures for the agency.

MS. BANKHEAD: Good morning. For the record, my name is Renita Bankhead, of your staff.

Beginning on page 10 of your materials these are the expenditures for the agency as of February 28.

Our total expenditures as of the end of February were \$56.7 million. That compares to about \$63 million for this same period last year. In 2014 our expenditures were a little higher because we had higher expenditures for RTS and automation projects. This year we're trending a little lower on those projects.

So if you look at the encumbrances which are about \$58 million, most of that is in professional fees and services and a majority of that \$14.6 million is RTS, a little bit of it is what we've set aside to pay for the

1 Data Center. The other large encumbrances are plates 2 which is under purchase contract services which is \$17 3 million, and then grants \$10 million, and almost \$11 4 million and that is ABTPA, and we note that all of those 5 grants have been encumbered. That means they have been 6 obligated so that money is already set aside. 7 At the end of the year, some of these 8 encumbrances, if they are related to grants or any kind of 9 capital purchases, those encumbrances will stay, if 10 they're for services, some of them might lapse, and any 11 other kind of encumbrances for purchases of supplies and 12 that kind of thing, those things will lapse as well. 13 MR. WALKER: Renita, excuse me, I don't mean to 14 interrupt you, but I understand when you said it's encumbered, but have we distributed it also? 15 16 MS. BANKHEAD: Yes, those grants have been 17 distributed, so they're all set aside. 18 MS. FLORES: They've been awarded.

MS. BANKHEAD: They've been awarded.

MR. INGRAM: They're not paid.

MS. BANKHEAD: Not paid.

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. RODRIGUEZ: They're reimbursed as they're spent.

MR. WALKER: So we still have a positive on our cash on hand that has not been disbursed yet.

1 MS. BANKHEAD: Yes, that is correct. 2 MR. WALKER: Does all that money generally get 3 disbursed by the end of the year? 4 MS. FLORES: They usually go into the new 5 fiscal year. By the end of the calendar year, all those 6 dollars are disbursed, but by August 31 not necessarily, 7 but by the end of the calendar year, yes. 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: They have a high spreading 9 ratio of the grants that are approved in there, somewhere 10 in the area of 98 percent or something like that is what I 11 recall the last report we got. But encumbered means set 12 aside, they're committed funds. They're not reimbursed to 13 the agencies until they have provided the expense reports 14 associated with each claim, and those are either monthly 15 or quarterly, I'm not sure what they're doing right now. 16 MR. WALKER: So we don't just write them a 17 check? 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No. 19 MR. WALKER: They have to turn in bills for 20 that? MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right. They're reimbursed on a 21 22 spent basis. In other words, the agencies have to provide 23 the financials indicating they've been spent, so the first 24 cash out really is at the agencies' expense.

MR. WALKER: So if somebody says we're going to

1	hire an additional detective and they have to pay him
2	monthly \$3,000 a month, whatever it might be, so we just
3	monthly pay them?
4	MS. FLORES: It's on a quarterly basis
5	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Based on expenditures. In
6	other words, the city or whomever the recipient of that
7	grant is actually the first out of money entity as opposed
8	to us. They're out of money until we reimburse them.
9	MR. WALKER: Five years, six years, first time
LO	I've ever known that. I thought we just granted the money
L1	and sent the checks.
L2	MS. FLORES: No, sir. And I'm sure that part
L3	of their submissions are reviewed to ensure that those
L 4	activities are eligible under that particular grant award.
L 5	MR. WALKER: Thank you.
L 6	MR. BARNWELL: Who reviews that?
L7	MS. FLORES: The ABTPA program staff, Brian
L 8	Wilson and his grant coordinators.
L 9	MR. BARNWELL: And they look at whether or not
20	the expenditures were appropriate?
21	MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.
22	MR. BARNWELL: And then they tell us that the
23	expenditures were appropriate.
24	MS. FLORES: And then they issue a transaction

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

request to finance and we process it through the

1 accounting system. 2 MR. BARNWELL: So there's no check internally 3 in DMV, we take their representations. And I'm not saying 4 there's anything wrong with that, but I want to understand 5 the process. We take their representations as gospel and that's it. 6 7 MS. FLORES: I would defer to Brian to address 8 that specific question about the review of the grant 9 expenditures. 10 MR. BARNWELL: Is he the only one who gets grant expenditures? 11 12 MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. 13 MR. WALKER: No, no. 14 MR. BARNWELL: ABTPA is the only one. 15 MS. FLORES: In this agency he disburses grants 16 to the local law enforcement entities. 17 MS. BREWSTER: Excuse me. Whitney Brewster. 18 With ABTPA Board approval. 19 MR. WALKER: It has to be approved by their 20 board; they make the grants. We evaluate it and then they 21 make the decisions on where the money is granted and we 22 monitor the cash flow of that. I thought we just gave it out at one time. 23 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And it's not a word alone

basis, they've got to provide support material for the

1 claims. 2 MR. BARNWELL: And they provide that to ABTPA? 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. The claimant agency, 4 whomever that may be. If you've got grantee City A, whatever that is, and they've got to submit their claims 5 6 with the backup. 7 MR. BARNWELL: Okay. I just wanted to know how 8 that process works. Thank you. 9 MR. WALKER: Let the record reflect that it is 8:27 and Board Member Rush is finally here. Okay. Now we 10 11 can start. 12 (General laughter.) 13 MS. BANKHEAD: Moving on to page 12 of your 14 briefing materials, these are the capital projects. 15 majority of our capital expenditures, as you can see, is 16 under our automation projects which is primarily RTS 17 refactoring. 18 MR. INGRAM: Could I take you back just one 19 second? 20 MS. FLORES: Sure. 21 MR. INGRAM: So just to clarify, I want to make 22 sure I'm reading it right, your expectation of our lapse 23 at the end of our year is \$6.88 million? MS. FLORES: That's our estimate at this time, 24

yes, sir. And that's after we did a midyear review that

1 you're going to see later on in your packet. 2 MR. INGRAM: I'm sorry to interrupt, just 3 making sure I got it. 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's actually lower than what 5 it's been. Right? 6 MS. FLORES: Absolutely. 7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Substantially from the previous 8 cycles. Right? 9 MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. 10 MR. INGRAM: That's lower than the previous 11 cycle? 12 MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. I think at one time we 13 lapsed approximately \$16 million. 14 MR. INGRAM: Wow. I don't remember that. 15 Okay, thanks. 16 MR. WALKER: So Linda, going forward, I don't 17 know if this is -- I guess we could insert it right here, 18 but on lapsed funds, when we go to the self-directed 19 independent fund, will we have to lapse that money at that 20 point in time or not? MS. FLORES: All state agencies who receive 21 22 revenues and who receive budgets and don't spend their 23 budgets, those dollars do lapse into whatever fund they're 24 financed from, so they're considered lapsed unless they're 25 tied to some type of capital project that carries forward

1 into the new year, the new biennium. Most state agencies 2 will lapse at least 3 percent of their operations. 3 MR. WALKER: So that's why Representative 4 Pickett wanted to put that sweep mechanism into our bill 5 there? 6 MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. 7 MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, with the 8 establishment of the TxDMV Fund, our unspent dollars would 9 lapse into the TxDMV Fund, and then we could potentially 10 be appropriated out of those funds moving forward. MR. WALKER: So it just really lapses into our 11 own fund. 12 13 MS. FLORES: Correct. 14 MR. WALKER: Not into the general fund. 15 MS. FLORES: It just depends on what your 16 method of financing is. Today we're general revenue, so yes, it would lapse into general revenue. But once the 17 18 DMV fund is created, then whatever lapses occur would 19 occur in that particular account. 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just to be clear, that's 21 future, number one. 22 MS. FLORES: Future. 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And number two, regardless of 24 where it lapses to, we're still tied to a budget that's 25 approved by the legislature.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. FLORES: Absolutely.

MR. INGRAM: It's not a free fall for the

3 money.

2.5

MS. FLORES: No, at this point it's not.

MR. WALKER: We can't have parties?

MS. FLORES: No parties.

(General laughter.)

MS. BANKHEAD: So we're going to move on to the midyear review. The end of February we prepared a midyear review, and as was stated before, we came up with an estimated lapse of \$6.8 million, almost \$6.9 million. Of that, we funded some approved midyear items, and most of those items, the capital items were related to DCF, some other things for the regional offices that we funded from county RTS, and some things that we funded out of our regular capital operating budget.

The operating portion was postage for the VTR Division for them to mail their materials. So at the end of our process, we ended up with about \$4.7 million and most of that \$4.7 million that was remaining is county RTS funds. So we're looking to see how we're going to be able to expend those funds or to be able to use those before the end of the year or to investigate some ways to be able to roll those funds forward.

And with that, that ends my presentation.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Renita.

MS. FLORES: At this time we'd like to go ahead and move on to the appropriations request update, because we do have some good news to share with the board regarding the 2016-17 appropriations request.

As you all know, the agency has been heavily involved in the appropriations process. As of May 20 we had performed 174 cost estimates for proposed legislation. This is compared to 147 fiscal notes that we did during the 83rd Legislative Session.

And the two large bills that we had that have been addressed is the creation of the DMV Fund which is Senate Bill 1512 by Senator Hancock, and the House Bill 6 which is the funds consolidation bill which during the last legislative session ended up abolishing the creation of the DMV Fund. Those two bills have passed. I believe Senate Bill 1512 has gone on to the Governor's Office to be signed, so the agency will have its own DMV Fund in September 1, 2016. House Bill exempted the DMV Fund from being abolished this time around. So those two things aligned perfectly this go-round, so we're going to be a self-sufficient agency in fiscal year 2017.

The other thing to share with you is the agency received dollars for a new building, and that's a major win for this agency. We are on our way to being totally

win for us. They also gave us money to relocate the staff at Bull Creek because as you know, TxDOT sold that property. There is a sale back lease provision that allows our agency staff to stay there until February 2018, however, if we need to move ahead of that schedule, we have \$1.5 million to relocate our staff, and that's approximately 120 full-time staff out there.

MR. WALKER: They have not voted yet on Senate Bill 2, have they?

MS. FLORES: House Bill 1 has not gone out.

This is conference committee recommendations, so at this point, unless something terrible happens, this is their recommendation.

MR. WALKER: Anything can happen over there, I figured out, at the last minute.

MS. FLORES: We are very confident that this is going to go through.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: On the DMV Fund, it all goes as is and 9/1 we're standing out of that fund right there. It also narrows the window by which we have to pass certain rules on fee assessments and things like that. Right? So we've got to stay on schedule in order to do that because we've got to generate funds in order to self-support.

MS. FLORES: And that was why we delayed the creation of the fund until the second year of the biennium because we knew that we wouldn't have everything in place by this September which is year one of the new biennium.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just so we're all clear.

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. It's important to note that we will have to establish some fees so that they can start being deposited into the fund on day one. There is also a provision for a \$23 million transfer on day one to ensure that we have the cash flow we need to continue to pay bills and pay our staff, so that's also included in those provisions.

MR. INGRAM: I don't think I fully understand the Chief's point about changing. What do we have to change?

MS. FLORES: Well, right now the fees that we're collecting that happened during the 83rd, all of those fees are being deposited to general revenue, so we're going to pull those fees out of general revenue and make them point to the DMV Fund. However, those fees today are not enough to cover our agency's appropriations, so we will have to establish a new process and handling fee to cover that difference, and really, that process and handling fee is supposed to cover the cost of registration and some infrastructure for the agency, but there's still

a gap.

So there are certain processes that we have to follow to ensure that we set up that fee, we have to change rules, we have to post it in the Texas Register for public comment, because some of those fees are currently charged today, for example, the \$1 automation fee is currently charged on a person's registration. Once we establish the process and handling fee, that fee moves into that particular process and handling fee and it will not be a stand-alone out here, it will now be part of that process and handling fee. We are going to be sure that it retains its fee so that we can always track that \$1 revenue collections, but now it's going to be under the umbrella of the process and handling fee.

MR. INGRAM: The other point I'm making is that the passage of this, once we start moving in that direction and the window narrows by which we have to do this in order to be able to have the funding in place to meet the budget needs.

MR. WALKER: We've got a long road ahead to work on that deal.

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: And there will be committees set up and we've got most stuff in place to start heading that direction, I think.

MS. FLORES: And just two more things that we also received funding for, and again, these are very critical to the agency's ability to be a stand-alone agency. For IT, we call it AMSIT -- because we like acronyms -- it's application migration server infrastructure transformation, \$7.5 million, and this is to continue the separation of the agency's servers from TxDOT. And we also got \$2-1/2 million just to stay up with our obligations to the State Data Center.

MR. WALKER: So I guess the question, more importantly, is the stuff that we did not get, is there anything in there you think that's going to hurt us going down the road?

MS. FLORES: We did not get people that we requested. We requested some additional staff for VTR, for Enforcement and for Administrative Services to run a building.

MR. WALKER: So let me ask you a question.

This has always confused me. You say you didn't get the people, but as long as I've been doing this up here, we have never, ever fully staffed this agency, and today we have 41 open FTEs. Is that not correct?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: So why do we need people if we have the availability of 41 right now in our bucket?

1	MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, the vacancies that
2	we have are as a result of natural turnover. We're at
3	about 7.1 percent for this month. For FY '14 we were 9
4	percent, but as this agency has matured, we have been able
5	to recruit and retain folks a lot more effectively. So I
6	think the statewide average for all agencies is 11
7	percent, so the agency is doing a pretty good job in terms
8	of our turnover rate.
9	MR. WALKER: So most state agencies have an 11
10	percent vacancy rate.
11	MS. BREWSTER: That's across the state. Yes,
12	sir.
13	MR. WALKER: So our vacancy at 41 we have,
14	Ithink, 41, isn't it?
15	MS. BREWSTER: For FY '14 it was 9 percent; for
16	this month I think it's something like 7.21 percent.
17	MR. RODRIGUEZ: One of the areas that I thought
18	was shorthanded in terms of personnel was the new
19	operation for hearings.
20	MR. WALKER: The operation for what?
21	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Our hearings.
22	MR. WALKER: Oh, hearings.
23	MR. RODRIGUEZ: So I'm just wondering I
24	don't need it right now, but at some point in time maybe
25	we could get a report on how they're doing in terms of

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

hearings.

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: Is Daniel on the agenda today?

MS. BREWSTER: Edward Sandoval is our Office of Administrative Hearings chief judge, and we'd be happy to give the board a briefing at a future date.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just wondering how they're managing.

MR. WALKER: We should probably get briefed on how that's going. Hadn't really heard since that started up.

MS. FLORES: So as you aptly pointed out, we did not receive a few things. We did not get cars, we did not get people and we did not get the cybersecurity services that IT had felt was really important for us to protect our data.

For the most part if it's a capital line item that was not approved by an appropriations committee, an agency is not allowed to spend any dollars on those initiatives if we were able to find the dollars. If they are turned down by an appropriations committee, it dies, it is not something that you can take on during the biennium. What we'll do is we'll do what we can do for this coming biennium and then try again the following legislative session.

MR. WALKER: So we've always asked for cars, it seems like. I guess that's kind of like my kids when they were in high school, always needing a car, but we always made do with the old one that mom didn't need anymore.

But on our replacement vehicles there, Linda, that's not something that encumbers us to not be able to do our job because instead of buying a car don't we just go out and rent a car when somebody needs a car and we have the appropriate funds available to do that?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir, you're correct. And we

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir, you're correct. And we also provide travel reimbursement if an individual uses their own car; we'll pay them mileage.

MR. WALKER: So in our budget, when that happens do we have another line item that says travel expenditures?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir, absolutely.

MR. WALKER: So if we would have gotten those cars, we would be over budgeted in that particular line item?

MS. FLORES: In some cases we would have had some lapse from those operating, but a lot of times what we'll do is we'll move the dollars around within our budget categories. If they don't need it for travel reimbursement, maybe they can use it to buy other equipment, operating equipment, or repairs. We do a lot

of dollars on our vehicle repairs. Those are going up and up and up.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just one observation, Mr. Chairman. The risk we run when we submit a wide list of needs or wants to the legislature is we get turned down this way, and then we can't do them should we come up with the money at some point, and so we may want to reconsider that approach next time around on some of these things.

MS. FLORES: I will say during this session we were inundated with questions from the Legislative Budget Board regarding vehicles. One side approved vehicles, the other -- I think it was House who approved -- Senate approved, House did not, and ultimately it didn't make it, but there was some consideration for vehicles.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ RODRIGUEZ: Do we have access to the motor pool?

MS. FLORES: No, sir. The 43 vehicles that we have is our pool, and their mileage is getting up there. I think probably in the next biennium it's certainly going to be over 150,000 miles per vehicle. So what we try to do is we manage as best we can. We move vehicles around the state. If one part of the state is using the more, then we move those to other areas that are not using them as much, so we try to manage the mileage that way.

For the worst of the worst, we do go and seek,

1 if you will, hand-me-downs from other state agencies and 2 we've been successful with that, particularly from DPS. 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just want to say so not only 4 these are budget requests that were declined, but in 5 effect, these are specifically declined items. MS. FLORES: Yes, new vehicles. Yes, sir. 6 7 MR. WALKER: I had a question. So this totally 8 is getting off in another direction somewhat, but we're on 9 the cars here, and the state doesn't have a motor pool 10 that maintains these cars, we maintain these cars 11 ourselves? MS. FLORES: We maintain the cars ourselves. 12 13 MR. WALKER: So we have somebody within the 14 agency that says, okay, there's this many miles and the 15 oil needs to be changed and so forth? MS. FLORES: We have one person who manages 16 17 that and then we contract out with Jiffy Lube or someone 18 to take care of our vehicles. MR. WALKER: So who makes the determination 19 20 that we go and say, hey, that car, the transmission is 21 slipping in it and it's better that we dispose of the car 22 than let it sit out in the parking lot and deteriorate? 23 MS. FLORES: We have one staff person in my 24 division who manages that, and sometimes he'll go out and 25 have to pick up a stranded staff person -- we've been

1 known to do that -- take it the closest shop and get an 2 assessment. 3 MR. WALKER: So let's just say that we have a 4 car that the transmission is slipping in it and we really 5 ought to dispose of the car, so does he have to take bids on it? 6 7 Well, he'll take it to a shop and MS. FLORES: 8 they'll make an assessment, and if it's beyond help, then 9 we'll surplus that vehicle -- and there's a state process 10 for that -- and he'll go out to the DPS state offices here 11 in Austin and see if they have anything that they can hand down. And so we'll take a look at that, he'll make an 12 13 assessment, he'll check out the car, because they'll sell 14 their cars for a lot cheaper, and we'll use that until it dies on the road somewhere. 15 16 MR. INGRAM: On the hand-down process from DPS, 17 and you make it sound like they're just giving it to us, 18 we're buying it from DPS. 19 MS. FLORES: We're buying it, yes, sir. 20 MR. INGRAM: The funds that we use to actually 21 pay them, where does it come from? It's not allocated. 22 MS. FLORES: We have some money set aside for 23 that type of acquisition. 24 MR. INGRAM: Okay. 25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Linda, is there a state

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

depreciation policy that we subscribe to?

MS. FLORES: Absolutely. And that was a lot of the questions that we received from the Legislative Budget Board. The state has a ten-year/150,000-mile stipulation before you're authorized to receive a new vehicle, and that's what we use for our request.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: And do we depreciate these vehicles through a depreciation fund, or is it strictly a line item?

MS. FLORES: It's a line item.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.

MS. FLORES: That concludes the update on the appropriations process. Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Linda, did you leave me?

I'd like to acknowledge Representative Joe
Pickett over here. He is the state representative from El
Paso. Since Mr. Palacios was not here, he asked that Joe
come over and substitute and make sure that El Paso was
being taken care of.

Representative Pickett has been a very good friend to the agency. He has carried a lot of the legislation that has affected us this session. He has worked diligently -- I know because I have talked to him numerous times myself -- about getting the stuff that the agency needed passed and he is probably one of our best

friends over there at the Capitol we have today.

And Joe, thank you very much for coming today. We always enjoy having you over here and hearing your comments and seeing how you would like us to push along your bills.

So thank you very much, Linda, for your report there.

Let's go to why don't we do a legislative update next. I'm going to board item number 4.B.

Caroline. And you can tell Mr. Pickett what's been going on over at the Capitol because I'm sure he needs to be enlightened.

(General laughter.)

MS. LOVE: Good morning. I'm Caroline Love, director of Government and Strategic Communications for the Department of Motor Vehicles. And thank you for having me here this morning. I wanted to give you all a rundown of what has happened during the session and also as it relates to DMV operations.

I'll start out with a general overview. There are now three days left in the legislative session and we have a few deadlines at this point. All bills that would have been heard on the floor have been heard and conference committee reports or concurrence with changes are what are up for consideration. All those deadlines

will come to a head on Sunday, and then Monday, June 1, is when the legislature plans to adjourn sine die, and the corrections only are what are considered on Monday, so technically, there shouldn't be any substantive changes or additions on Monday.

With that, I thought I'd just kind of give a quick rundown of some statistics from the session. A total of 6,476 bills were filed. That includes local bills, big bills, joint resolutions. That's up 6.5 percent from the previous session. And there are five priority items that were identified by the governor, including pre-K early education, ethics reform, transportation funding -- which I'll defer to our guest on that one if he wants to say anything on that -- and also some higher education research initiatives, and border security was another one.

A lot of those items have either already had legislation passed or have agreements that have been arrived at by the members and they'll be considered further over this weekend. But it appears as though they have reached concurrence on those initiatives, and so therefore, the likelihood of a special session is small at this point, but we'll definitely know more come Monday.

Of those 6,476 bills, the Government and Strategic Communications Division monitored at one point

or another roughly 1,000 of those, and certainly a lot of those were not of a significant impact but we just wanted to kind of see what might have happened. And as it appears right now, we have identified about 100 bills that have a measurable impact to the agency, and that can be anything from the creation of specialty license plates to simply updating manuals to reflect some of the new changes in law.

So to kind of get into the agency impact legislation, I did want to talk about the department's omnibus bill, House Bill 2701 and Senate Bill 1043. So those bills had certainly every intent and they were on track to make it through to consideration on the House and Senate floors, but they just did not meet the proper deadlines to make it there in time. As I had somebody explain it to me, the bills were very good. They were so good that everybody wanted to be a part of it and that's kind of what made them crater.

But what was helpful is some of the more critical provisions that were in the bills that we identified as something we would really like to have this session, such as the TxIRP, the Texas International Registration Plan, participants and out-of-state vehicles, those vehicles and trailers were a group that we had a hard time fitting into the single sticker provisions, and

so House Bill 1888, by Representative Capriglione, which related to commercial motor vehicle operation was amended in the Senate to include those provisions. So we don't have to require proof of inspection for those groups of vehicles in order to move forward with registration so as not to create a burden on those groups. And that bill was brought up on the House floor yesterday and Representative Capriglione concurred with the Senate amendments, so that is on its way to the governor.

In addition, as mentioned earlier by Linda
Flores, Senate Bill 1512, by Senator Hancock, recreated
the DMV Fund, and Representative Pickett carried that on
the House side. There were just a few minor changes on
the House side related to the transfers on September 1,
2016 to make sure we remain whole, and when that was
turned over to the Senate, Senator Hancock concurred with
those changes yesterday, so that bill is also on its way
to the governor.

And very complementary to that is House Bill 6, and that is the funds consolidation bill. That bill, as it passed the House, included the DMV Fund re-creation and also exempted the fund from the funds consolidation provision. In the Senate they changed it on the floor to remove the fund re-creation so as not to be in conflict with Senate Bill 1512, but they did maintain the fund

consolidation exemption for the DMV Fund. Therefore, since it was in both chambers, when that bill will likely go to conference committee because it contains several different funds and items, that provision will remain since it was in both the House and Senate versions.

MR. WALKER: But there's no chance of a problem going forward there, is there

MS. LOVE: Not that I'm aware of, but we'll stay on it. I'll continue to walk those halls and make sure that it stays okay.

And on a side note, the other board priority item was the salvage occupational licensing legislation. Both those bills were heard in the House and Senate respective committees but they never did make it to the floor for consideration. It seems as though there were just so many other major items going on this session that they just didn't make it through to fruition, but in talking with our Enforcement Division director, Bill Harbeson, and others, I believe there's many of those provisions that we can address by rule, so we're starting to look at that as well.

And Linda had already discussed the budget, so I think we're covered on that one. Some of the other bills that we identified as having a more significant impact, one bill is Senate Bill 1171, by Senator Nichols,

which updates the timber permits. It essentially lowers the fee right now from \$1,500 to \$900, and that is an effort to hopefully increase participation in that permit since we've had low participation since it was enacted last session.

MR. WALKER: What's the status of that bill?

MS. LOVE: It has been passed by both chambers and it's on its way to the governor.

MR. WALKER: So we're going to reduce one of our fees, but there's been no participation in that

MS. LOVE: Been very low participation, I believe around 40 permits.

MR. WALKER: I mean, I may be just jumping ahead on your report here, but I know the concrete people were very concerned about their permit. What's the status on that bill

MS. LOVE: Unfortunately, the concrete permit bill never made it. There was only a House filed version and it didn't make it out of the House, so there will be no changes to that bill.

Senate Bill 449, by Bettencourt, has been signed by the governor, and as of last Friday, people can register and title auto cycles, and that includes the Polaris Slingshot, so there are a lot of happy Slingshot owners out there right now.

In addition, there was Senate Bill 562 which had an allowance for an annual permit on the over-length loads which would be commonly used by utility carriers who have electric poles that are very long. That bill was signed by the governor and effective May 15, and the Motor Carrier Division has already sent out information to the stakeholders to make them aware of that permit availability.

Another bill, House Bill 735, by Representative Israel, would have DMV create an annual report, starting next year, on the number of vehicles in the state that are alternatively fueled, so that would be hybrid, electric and compressed natural gas, those types of vehicles would be included.

MR. WALKER: Like your car

MS. LOVE: My electric car.

And then lastly, I wanted to cover the specialty license plate bills because together they do have a rather significant impact on the department. There were several bills filed related to creating new specialty license plates; 32 bills appear to be on their way to the governor for signature, and some of them have already been signed. And if you total up all the plates that would be created by those bills, there will be 57 new specialty license plates that the department will be responsible for

creating come January 1 of 2016. And please note, we did ask for that delayed effective date to accommodate our RTS refactoring project and we were very well received by the legislature on that, so most all those bills have that delayed effective date to accommodate that.

Of those 57 new plates, 50 are related to military awards or recognitions, and the others are just some random, Texas Medical Center license plate, a Juneteenth license plate, there's one related to canines for cops support, so there's just a few odds and ends plates out there.

And that pretty much concludes the summary of what I have. We'll continue to update the board on our progress with implementation. We're very pleased with the outcome of what happened during the session so far. I guess the next few days will be telling. And of course, the governor has until January 21 to decide whether to veto or sign bills or allow bills to go into law without signature, so we'll continue to monitor that process.

MR. WALKER: So Caroline, on the statutory plates that are approved by the legislature, are they presented with a design, or is it just sent to us for us to design a plate for them

MS. LOVE: Yes, we will work on the designs.

MR. WALKER: So there's no design patterns that

were put out there

MS. LOVE: No.

MS. BREWSTER: And just to clarify, Caroline -- Whitney Brewster -- it is June 11, not January 21

MS. LOVE: Sorry. I guess my brain is a little fried after all.

MR. WALKER: So I guess Mr. Pickett, since we're on our legislative, is there anything that you would like to make comments about on the legislative session appropriate to the agency, or has Caroline covered most of it?

MR. PICKETT: I'm not used to being grilled, I do the grilling. For the record, my name is Joe Pickett, State Representative from El Paso.

What Caroline reported is very accurate. What she didn't say and can't say is all the back stories and the lies. If any of the board members want to know any particulars, please see me after hours, bring an adult beverage, and I'll tell you what the real truth is. With so many bills in such a short period of time, they really do get caught up in a lot of the other politics. 2701, being one of those, was put on a calendar and I watched it stay on the calendar for almost four days trying to get to it. It's just one of those things.

Your staff did a good job of breaking up some

of the bigger issues and we tried to shepherd other bills. I held special forum meetings trying to pass out bills that we could attach to. My committee is kind of in relationship to the bills that were filed, we had an increase quite a bit too. I think I started off with about 259 House bills and that committee usually hears somewhere around 160 to 180, and that's not counting Senate bills because we try not to count Senate bills at all. I file a bill every year to get rid of the Senate; I can pass the House but I can't get a hearing in the Senate.

(General laughter.)

2.5

MR. PICKETT: But overall, I think it is a pretty good session, not just DMV but transportation.

Sometime today, possibly tomorrow, I may be presenting to the House our final plan on transportation funding. It's going to mean quite a lot of dollars. It's probably going to be the biggest we've ever done, and it's going to be a two-parter. There will be a base that will be set in constitution and we'll also be putting a formula growth factor in the constitution that will go out 15 and 10 years, respectively, and then we will be able to extend those in 10-year increments so that we can get some planning capability for TxDOT.

So we're not there yet, we've got three days

yet to go. Caroline said she didn't think there was a special, and if there's anybody that can cause one in the next three days, he's sitting in front of you. This is the last item on the governor's hot list. I don't really see that happening, but there would be some last-minute maneuvering on some stuff. But overall it was a pretty good session.

MR. WALKER: So I have a question for you.

MR. PICKETT: Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. WALKER: I know that the agency is not here to promote legislation and legislation that you and other representatives carry for the agency are kind of cleanup measures to fix things from prior sessions that need to be tweaked, so to speak, so in our omnibus bill I know that the bill is pretty broad and it goes in there and says transportation fixes or whatever it says on the top of it there. Going forward, Joe -- and I learned a whole lot in this session about politics and how you play the game over there, so to speak -- would be better on our omnibus bill -- I mean, everybody was using ours as the mechanism to try to get through the process, would be better to try to restrict our bill to be more specific and put more bills out there, maybe, or is it better to leave one broad bill?

MR. PICKETT: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend

you doing both. I have no problem, personally, with an omnibus bill. When we can get an omnibus bill out moving quickly, we don't have the same issues. There were other social issues and some hot buttons that pushed 2701 back, so my recommendation would be to do both. It's easier for me, as a chairman, to handle an omnibus bill. As we get later in the session, having shell bills or having backups that are pieced out into three or four different categories does help and we could move those at the same time. So I know that wasn't maybe a definitive answer for you but I would say both the belt and suspenders, I would do both.

And every session we have the hindsight. Last session when we passed 2202, we didn't know there was going to be another omnibus bill out there, a funding bill that would have swept all those funds, and so we passed a pretty big omnibus bill last session without any problems, but there was just another one.

And your staff did a good job, Mr. Chairman. I bug them a lot. I probably go through your bills in a lot more detail than others have done in the past. Sometimes my colleagues want to play, sometimes they don't; I grill people on their bills, I expect the same. So I find stuff in the different drafts, sometimes we have two and three and four iterations before we have something that we feel

confident about passing. And I know I do drive them crazy but we all learn something from it, and I'm getting to know the DMV code pretty closely. I'm here to apply for a license plate for the Taiwan government, if you don't mind; I'd like to get a specialty plate for Taiwan.

MR. WALKER: I don't think that was on our agenda today.

MR. PICKETT: It's not on your agenda but it's in the code and I'd like to have one.

(General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: Thank you very much for your comments on Caroline.

MR. PICKETT: Caroline, your executive director, Ms. Brewster, and Jeremiah Kuntz, also met with several of your support staff. You guys are almost like DPS, I call them and there's six or seven that have to come at once. It's kind of like DMV, I call Caroline or Whitney, and four or five would show up, so that's okay.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a statement and a request, Mr. Chairman. First, I want to say thanks for your service. I know that DMV is just one of many things that pull at you over there, border stuff and everything else, public safety and all that. So you've been up there a long time and I've seen your work, and I just want to tell you and I publicly have an opportunity now to say

1 thank you for your public service. 2 My question is this: what is a preferred adult 3 beverage? 4 MR. PICKETT: For me this time of year it would 5 be probably a Pinot Grigio or something like that. 6 (General laughter.) 7 MR. WALKER: Mr. Pickett, you have also a 8 request to speak, and since we have you up front, you have 9 a request under our open comments to speak on item 5.A which is the Texas Transportation Study, so while I've got 10 11 you up here. Do you want to wait for the presentation? 12 MR. PICKETT: Yes. Why don't you lay it out. 13 Do you mind if I stay here? 14 MR. WALKER: You can stay there. MR. PICKETT: So I don't have to hide behind 15 16 that pole. I've got people looking for me, I want to give 17 them a clear shot. 18 (General laughter.) 19 MR. KUNTZ: Good morning, members. For the 20 record, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. 21 22 I'm presenting for your consideration the final 23 draft of the Texas Transportation Institute's report on 24 the study of the cost to process vehicle registration and

title transactions. Today staff is requesting that you

25

take action to accept the report as presented and declare TTI's contractual obligations to submit the report as complete. I want to make sure that we're real clear on the action that we're taking today. Today we are just accepting this report, this is not an action to adopt any fees or propose rules, it's merely the acceptance of the report to fulfill a contractual obligation.

As you're aware, DMV entered into a contract with TTI to conduct a study on April 11, 2014. During the 83rd Legislative Session, House Bill 2202, as was mentioned, passed granting authority for the board to establish a registration processing and handling fee to cover the cost of the DMV, the counties and their deputies associated with issuing registration. We want to make sure that we're specific. The 2202 processing and handling fee is specific to registrations, it does not cover title transactions. The study itself, while it looked at both the cost of processing registrations and transactions, 2202 merely charges the board with setting a processing and handling fee and establishing compensation for the counties, their deputies, as well as funding for the agency specific to registration transactions alone.

The purpose of the study was as follows: to understand and determine the actual costs associated with processing registration and titling transactions in order

to determine an appropriate processing and handling fee. This is the first step in actions that will be coming forth between now and we have a timeline of looking at August to have proposed rules in front of the board in order to try and meet a January 1 effective date for a processing and handling fee.

I believe if you look in your board packets on page 64 of your briefing book, there's a timeline that tries to back up from a January 1 effective date, so you'll get an idea of the different steps that we'll be taking over the next few to try and institute that processing and handling fee.

And I'll get into the report a little bit now.

TTI performed site visits at the following counties:

Brewster, Dallas, El Paso, Harris, Hidalgo, Howard,

Jasper, Refugio, Wheeler, and Williamson. Additionally,

TTI performed site visits at various full-service deputies and limited service deputies in Bexar, El Paso, Hidalgo, and Travis counties.

The general methodology that TTI used was to gather information about the counties' operating budgets and their costs associated with processing title and registration transactions. Those costs included things such as salary and benefits, equipment and supplies used in processing transactions, postage -- we want to make

sure that we're clear that it does include postage; there have been many questions about that -- as well as other operating costs, those operating costs also including rent, utilities, equipment and consumables. This is meant to be a fully loaded cost.

2.5

They went in and gathered information from the counties on their operating budgets for the county tax assessor-collectors' operations specific to the motor vehicle operations. What TTI did was to attempt, in certain instances where the county tax assessor-collector also processed property tax, to allocate those costs out specifically to the motor vehicle operations and to carve out those costs associated with processing property tax, so it does not include those property tax costs in the report.

transaction data from DMV. We provided them with transaction data specific to walk-in transactions, online transactions, mail-in transactions, as well as transactions conducted by full-service and limited service deputies for title and registration transactions. Their methodology for calculations allocated the counties' expenses across the transactions. They also then further distributed costs based on the type of transactions method.

make sure that we're clear on how they did their methodology because there's two directions that you could perform this methodology — they took the total operating budget and then divided it by the number of transactions processed to get down to a per-transaction basis. They did not start from the bottom, i.e., gathering information about costs associated with utilities in the area or general salaries in the area and then try and build into it from that direction, so they actually took county budgets and then divided them by transactions. So all these are based on actual county budgeted dollars, it is not an estimation of what a county's budget should be.

MR. WALKER: Does it take into consideration the portion of that work that is related to the DMV with respect to the other people doing other functions of their job?

MR. KUNTZ: It is specific to motor vehicle functions, it does not include functions outside of the motor vehicle processing of registration and title transactions, so it is specific to those types of transactions.

MR. INGRAM: So how do you split the budget when you have somebody that is doing both activities that's working on multiple things?

MR. KUNTZ: TTI allocated that cost based on what the percentage of business reported by the county was. So if the county informed them that 50 percent of the work was being performed for motor vehicle versus 50 percent, then they would allocate those costs on a percentage basis. In some instances the counties had specific budgets associated with the motor vehicle operation, and so they would take 100 percent of those costs because they weren't intermingled with the property tax.

Finally, TTI calculated a statewide weighted average per transaction and type. When they did this, they did a weighted average based on the transaction volume. Within the actual breakdown of mail-in, online and in-person transaction, they used the time study in order to weight the costs associated with those based on the time that it takes to perform those transactions. So they would just basically take a full workday and basically divide it based on the time it takes to process the transactions so that they could allocate costs even further based on the type of transaction and how long it takes to perform those transactions.

So what you end up with is a statewide weighted average for walk-ins at \$2.59, for online at \$1.36, mail-in at \$1.97 for the county tax office. For full-service

deputies for registration it's \$4.06, and for a title it's \$12.88. For a limited service deputy for a registration renewal -- that's the only transaction they perform -- it is \$1.11. Again, these are statewide weighted averages. In the back of the report they have specific allocations of costs for each of the counties, so you can actually look and see, based on the size of the county, what those differences are between a large, medium and small county to get a feel for what the different cost variations are per transaction across those counties.

MR. WALKER: So let me ask you this -- and I know we don't want to get into too much of the ditches on this thing right now -- does a tax assessor clerk in El Paso County make the same hourly wages as a tax assessor clerk in Harris County and in Wheeler County?

MR. KUNTZ: We did not get into the level of detail of what the average salary is. What they did is they took the total salary and wages budget and they divided that by the transactions. So what you'll see, generally, is that in some of the smaller counties you have a higher cost per transaction and generally that is a function not of the salary being paid but because your denominator is the number of transactions, you're spreading those costs over fewer transactions.

So obviously, if you have an employee, you have

to have an employee that works for a full workday, that salary is set regardless of what their hourly wage is, and then you divide that by the number of transactions that they process in a day. In your high volume counties, your Dallas, your Harris County, they have a whole lot more transactions that they're spreading those costs out over, they have less dead time in the day so you have less capacity, if you will, in that day to process additional transactions. Whereas, in some of the smaller counties you may have more time that elapses between transactions that's not occurring in those counties. That's going to be your single largest driver in the difference between your costs when you look at your small, medium and large counties. MR. WALKER: Well, I quess my question still is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. WALKER: Well, I guess my question still is do clerks in Harris County make more or less per hour than a clerk in Brewster County?

MR. KUNTZ: I don't have that information. We did not gather an hourly wage.

MR. WALKER: But the counties set the payroll for their county, the state has nothing to do with that. Right?

MR. KUNTZ: We have no influence on it.

MR. WALKER: There's the answer to my question. Thanks.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Jeremiah, we'll have an opportunity for those counties to make those specifics known in the process. Once we decide to post a rule out there for vetting, it's during that process that we'll be able to get this information back to us and then arrive at the number, whatever that number may be. This is just a report that we contracted for.

2.5

MR. KUNTZ: Yes, sir. To that exact point, this report is a starting point, this was in order to gather information to try and understand better what that cost per transaction is so that we can move forward. To me, in any balance sheet there's always an expenditure side and a revenue side, and so this is merely giving us the one side of the equation which is how much does it cost to process transactions so that we can better associate and figure out what that cost is.

The processing and handling fee is not the only source of revenue for counties. They have title transaction fees that they're able to retain. There's also a base formula funding that's set in statute that allows them to retain 100 percent of the registrations up to certain levels, and that is a great way to equalize, if you will, for some small counties where their transaction volume would not generate a substantial amount of money to cover those costs. That formula funding helps kind of

level the playing field for everybody.

Now that we've got kind of a cost estimation, we can plug that into a model and then calculate what the compensation would need to be, based on the formula funding as well as title fees that they get and all of the other fees that they're able to retain, so this is one piece of the pie, if you will.

Our steps going forward, as I mentioned, we've got a schedule here. We have a work group of county tax assessor-collectors, as well as other stakeholders, the auto industry, we've got lienholders, rental car industry, that we will be sitting down and going over this report with them next week on the 3rd to try and gather any additional information or observations that they may have on the report, and then to start talking about how to structure the compensation side. There's a multitude of different ways that that compensation could be structured, and so we need to have a good perspective from them on how to move forward with that. But time is definitely of the essence at this point to get this going by January 1.

MR. INGRAM: So Jeremiah, I have a question. The numbers, the final numbers that they came up with, they're weighted.

MR. KUNTZ: It's a weighted average, statewide weighted average.

MR. INGRAM: So I get that, but when I look at the report I can't find the actual numbers for each individual county, so that's what I'm missing. I can't find that.

2.5

MR. KUNTZ: Let me direct you to the report. I'll just direct you to the last page, it will be the easiest place to try and find that. On page 56 of the report this is Williamson County's. If you look at the very bottom of the report, there's a title that says cost per transaction, and you do not want the weighted cost, it's the cost per transaction, in Williamson County \$2.95 for walk-in, mail-in \$2.16, online \$1.39, and a walk-in title \$9.33. Each of the counties have that same row of data there.

If you go back one, look at Wheeler County, which is going to be one of your small counties, they have a walk-in cost per transaction of \$15.86 per registration walk-in. Again, that disparity is based on the transaction volume, and they have a very low transaction volume but they have fixed costs, they have to staff an office, they have to pay rent, utilities, all those other things, so they have less transactions to spread that cost out over, and that reflects itself in a much higher per transaction cost.

Again, though, when we start looking at their

base formula funding that is set out in statute, that is a great way, I guess, for them to get compensated to help out with those fixed costs. That formula funding should be sufficient in those counties to be able to cover that cost.

MR. WALKER: Jeremiah, I know through the years I've heard that different counties -- I'm going to use Dallas County, since John Ames is sitting over here -- is that don't some of the counties that have a bigger burden of work contract out to some of the smaller counties to do their work for them, though?

MR. KUNTZ: They do not.

MR. WALKER: I thought at one time that's what they were looking at.

MR. KUNTZ: Statute does allow counties to contract with one another to process online and mail-in transactions. I'm not aware of any counties that have done so to this point. But there is the ability for counties to do each other's work should they enter into an agreement. There's also a provision in law that allows during a natural disaster for adjacent counties to process on behalf of a county that is closed down due to a natural disaster, and that has taken place in the past when we've had counties that are shut down due to hurricanes or flooding or any issues like that.

1 With that, that concludes my presentation. 2 MR. WALKER: Thank you. 3 So I guess I need a motion to accept the 4 report. Is that not correct? 5 MR. RUSH: So moved. 6 MR. BARNWELL: Second. 7 MR. WALKER: So we have a motion by Mr. Rush to 8 accept the report, I have a second by Mr. Barnwell, and at 9 this point in time are there any comments, questions or discussion? 10 11 (No response.) MR. WALKER: So what I'm going to do is I'm 12 13 going to take the motion and take the second, but then I'm 14 going to go into the comments, and so we have one public 15 comment that would like to be made prior to the approval 16 of that, and then we could amend the motion at that point 17 in time. 18 So Mr. Pickett, the floor is yours. 19 MR. PICKETT: Mr. Chairman, let me go back a 20 little bit first and tell the board what I proposed in 2202 and what comments I made to the legislature and why I 21 22 think they passed a portion of 2202. 23 The legislature is not an easy sell to give a 24 board the authority that we gave you in 2202.

specific dollar amounts so that we can debate and discuss

25

and cuss them and decide whether they should go in statute, so this was a big departure to say we're going to let you set the fees on the registration part. I want to make that clear. My selling point that I began with were some of the items that Jeremiah already told you. You can go into an H.E.B. and pay a dollar; the best deal I thought out there was the extra one dollar mail it in, that was my form, that's what I used to do, that was really easy. I would get that registration and I'd make a copy of my insurance, I'd include the extra dollar, send it in, I thought that was a great bargain. And then come along and I tried the online, and now I'm sold, I'm paying two bucks and I love it, and I probably pay for more individual automobile registrations than everybody in this room, pretty close, personally.

MR. WALKER: I bet I got you beat.

MR. PICKETT: Personally, Mr. Chairman, not as a business expenditure that I can take off my income tax.

(General laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PICKETT: So going back to what the legislature proposed was trying to uniform a fee so that we could get maybe persons to go one way or the other.

I've read the report and you'll notice that the online registrations are the least of a cost and you can probably make more money there, and I was very surprised two years

ago in 2013 what the percentage was. And maybe, Jeremiah, you can tell us what the update is but I thought it was like 14 percent or less that was online, and I just thought nowadays it would be somewhere 30-40 percent.

2.5

But anyway, we told the legislature that we were going to try to get the fee somewhere whether you went to H.E.B., whether or you mailed it in, whether you did it online or you went into your tax assessor-collector, that there would be a pretty much uniform fee for the registration portion of it.

I'm a little frustrated that it's taken so long to get this off the ground, and now we've got an issue with the RTS system and all that. During that time the full-service deputies seem to be where a lot of rub is, and I come from one of those areas that has a full-service deputy model, and you've got the report, you can see that the numbers and what it costs everywhere are different. And my fiduciary duty is to the people that are registering their vehicles, that's where I go first. I'm trying to make it easy, efficient. I also know that the counties have not seen an increase, and without doing a study I suppose that the counties could have used an increase.

And one of those small things that we did find in 2202 -- and I tried to get Mr. Uresti to name a street

after me or a hospital or something and I couldn't get him to do it -- but we did find something in there that is an increase. We took out the 3 percent cost off the top of the \$10 road and bridge fee that was going to TxDOT, we removed that, so that's a 30 cent per transaction increase that began as soon as the bill went effective, but it obviously wasn't even enough to show much of a difference, and that was 30 cents. So if you took the \$1.90 and 30 cents, you could argue that counties are getting \$2.10 per transaction. Well, I doubt many of them have felt that.

So I'm hoping that when we get this all said and done, we can focus on the people that are registering those vehicles, find an efficient way for them to do that, get the counties the monies that they need for performing those services, and I think the toughest part for your board in your decision is what you're going to do with the fees for full-service deputies.

I will tell you in my county -- you asked a question, Mr. Chairman, of how much do they pay for the people doing the same work in various counties -- I know it's different but how about if you're not paying anything at all. Well, what do you mean, they're making a savings?

No. My particular county, the budget that the tax assessor-collector has pretty much dictates that he or she

will need to use full-service deputies for the transactions. And in my county the tax assessor-collector doesn't collect property taxes, and that may be one of the reasons that we have such a reduced staff over other places, it's not part of our model, so the county's budget for the purposes are quite a bit low.

2.5

So I'm asking or requesting that the fullservice deputy model is going to be important in some
places around the State of Texas and needs to be
maintained. I don't know that \$40 or \$50 for a title
transfer is appropriate so that may make some people
unhappy, but I think you need to have some flexibility,
and I would again urge you to get a registration fee that
helps push those of us who want to do the most efficient
way to get it done, that means more money to the counties.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'll be calling you about every month to see how you're doing on your timeline. You've called me over the last year and a half or so, we've had several discussions about this, and I have been asked by my colleagues who are involved in this where we are as well. Not all for them forgot that we passed this over two years ago.

With that, Mr. Chairman, if you have any questions.

MR. WALKER: Well, I have a few comments, and I

guess I did have a question. We do have a very tough road ahead of us to sit down, and we have a committee that has already been formed which has some of our board members -- Mr. Palacios and Ms. Caraway are both on that -- which will start next week and sit down and start digesting this data. There are also numerous TACs on that working group that are going to sit down and try to come up with a structure and fees, so forth.

One of the things that has always been interesting to me -- and I asked this question of Whitney the other day -- was that today we currently charge a dollar to mail it in or -- a dollar to walk up to the counter and \$2 to mail it in or whatever. I think that's right.

MR. KUNTZ: It does not cost the customer any additional fees to walk into a county office. If they mail it into a county office, it's an additional dollar. If they go online they actually pay \$3 more because they pay \$2 as the credit card processing fee as well as a mail return fee is really what that dollar is, it's the cost for the county to mail the sticker.

MR. WALKER: So I believe a whole lot the way
Chairman Pickett does over here is that I mail mine in and
go online and do it, but yet 70 percent of the people -and I remember asking this question to somebody on our

staff at one time, I said, Well, why would you want to go stand in line at John Ames's office over there for an hour to get that transaction done when I do it in my office and it takes five minutes to do it? And they told me that the reason is because it's cheaper to go stand in line than it is to mail it in.

MR. PICKETT: It's a little higher than that, it's about 79 percent, but I'm not sure that it's really the dollar or we just haven't been able to market the differences out there.

MR. WALKER: That might be right.

MR. PICKETT: It took me a while to do the online, and I, frankly, didn't see how it was going to work when I found out that all you really do need is the last four numbers of your VIN and your license plate number. And I think that may have been my original problem, I don't know my license plate number offhand, and I didn't realize it's on my registration sticker. Maybe if I'd have read it, it would have helped. But I got through the first one and figured out it was there, and yes, I signed up for the little tickler, do you want to be notified next year online, and so it's even going to be easier for me.

And so there's probably some marketing things that the agency can do as well, once you get this all said

and done. And as far as the counties are concerned, if they agree that the fees and the costs for the online are the most effective for them -- I asked my tax assessor what his situation, and currently he has one person assigned to handle just the online, he has one person assigned with a work station that does the mail-in, and he told me that they're starting to get a little bit busier, but it's a little precarious right now, he can't really pull somebody off the counter yet to do more of those other transactions, he's not there yet. So they're going to need some help transitioning and trying to get all this worked out as well.

MR. WALKER: So what you're saying is that somewhat the intent of the bill is that you want us to standardize the transaction fee, whether it's \$2, \$3, \$5, whatever it might be, and come up with one standard fee instead of taking and having multiple fees in order to push the business. In other words, if an online transaction is a dollar versus if they walk up to the counter at Dallas County and charge \$5, that they might be more inclined if it's less, you would rather see it be a standard fee.

MR. PICKETT: On the registration, Mr.

Chairman. And again, that's where I proposed to the

legislature where as now you said that you thought a lot

of the people go in there, the 79 percent, is because there's no additional charge. And this wasn't meant to be a tax increase -- and you and I have had that discussion with the former governor and those kind of things -- but we envisioned an across-the-board, not just the full-service deputies, not just the H.E.B.s, not just the online, we envisioned your tax assessor-collector getting a fee as well on top of what it is right now. So that, yes, you made that conscious decision now to go into your tax office knowing it's the same fee if you went online or you mailed it in or you went to H.E.B., and so I don't need to go into my tax assessor-collector because it doesn't save me anything.

And we gave you the ability to do whatever that amount. I personally think it would be better if it was kind of uniform on the registration, but it's not something that is hard and fast, but it would help if it was similar, if not the same. So the argument is, okay, I was a little hesitant about the online but it's the same fee. If you were to go to uniform fee, it would take a while before people who are going into their tax assessor-collector realize that there was a fee and they could do it online. You'd see it start to peel off, I'm sure, after six months, a year.

I have to tell you the Two Step, One Sticker,

I'm not a fan, wasn't a fan. You're kind of lucky I wasn't there to kill that bill when it originally went. I don't like it. I will also tell you that your agency and DPS, whoever gets most of the kudos, it's working pretty well. I expected a lot more complaints than I have gotten; I haven't gotten as many as I anticipated.

Obviously, the problems with the commercial trucks and those kind of things, but we'll see. It hasn't been nearly as bad, so even I can learn something.

And this is being recorded, I'm sure, so you can play that back if you'd like -- or leak it to the press, that seems to be the norm around here.

MR. WALKER: Well, I think it's working pretty well. We're kind of diverting off here, but one of the problems on the same sticker I heard the other day was I have friends of mine -- and you probably saw them in this room -- who have had vehicles that are out of the state, who own ski houses, I guess, in Colorado and they have cars that are registered in Texas, and it's like what are we going to do to get an inspection sticker on our car when it stays at my ski house in Colorado or my ranch, whatever it might be, and I think the legislature fixed that this session also, I believe.

MR. PICKETT: Well, actually, you guys had that taken care of. There's a form that says it's out of state

and I don't have to get it inspected until I bring it back into Texas, so that's been effective.

And it is part of the discussion. I think you need to take in all the other things that you're doing, even though we're here on 2202, that's part of the whole deal as well.

MR. WALKER: Well, I think that the counties have done a lot, the tax assessors and everybody, on the single sticker to make that deal work.

MR. PICKETT: They're probably getting complaints anyway. What we do, I wouldn't necessarily get a call. Mr. Uresti and the others who will get those anyway when they come up to the counter and they go:
You're going to have to have it inspected. And I'm sure
Mr. Uresti is being very clear to them that it was Joe
Pickett and the legislature that required to that change, so when you come back in another couple of hours, we'll be waiting for you again.

MR. WALKER: But I can also tell you this from my personal experience is that when you went to the single sticker, you also found a lot of vehicles that had not been getting inspected that now are being inspected, because I had a customer call me that had 300 pieces of equipment that were not inspected and now they can't register them and they had to go get them inspected.

MR. PICKETT: And it maybe shysters out there so it's easier to get a false one -- I'm just kidding.

(General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: Thank you very much.

Go ahead.

MR. INGRAM: I would just like to echo and thank you also for your comments with the single sticker, but I think a lot of that goes to Jeremiah. He really put together an excellent campaign to inform the public. And then also I want to echo your comments because I think that that's very relevant in this case is that I don't believe that thus far we've done a great job marketing the online and those other forums, and I think that with Jeremiah at the helm we can make some progress on that.

MR. PICKETT: I even asked my tax assessorcollector if he had the ability to put a small little
kiosk out in front of his counter because right now you go
in and you get in one line to see a person face to face.
And I said, Gosh, everybody does this now, even at the
legislature you can come register for a bill and all your
friends can register for a bill at a little kiosk, there's
no reason why you can't have a screen there.

I didn't like the self checkouts when they first started. I would go into Home Depot and some of the grocery stores and that really bothered me, and I'd stand

in line just so I could have a person take my credit card and be rude to me, so I decided why not just go talk to a machine, and for small purchases and quick in and out, I have changed. And so I think that the more that we offer you'll find out people will go: I don't like it; well, I'm thinking I might try it; well, gosh, that actually works pretty well. And that's been my experience. And so I still think there's a lot of things that tax assessorcollectors can do as well and encourage those kind of things.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'm probably not going to be able to hear some of the comments, but I'm going to ask if I can get a recap from Jeremiah or Caroline. We go in at ten o'clock and there's probably somebody in the State of Texas we haven't recognized their birthday or anniversary yet.

MR. WALKER: We have one more person that would like to make a comment. Our executive director, Ms.

Brewster, would like to take and make a comment, I think, before you leave.

MS. BREWSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Whitney Brewster.

To your comment about looking at different ways to innovate, one thing that the agency has recently established is an innovation and strategic analyst

1 position within the agency to focus on the things that 2 you --3 MR. PICKETT: What does it pay? I'm looking 4 for a job after Monday. 5 MS. BREWSTER: I'm sorry, it's already been 6 filled actually. Tom Schindell starts on Monday and he's 7 actually in the audience. And I just wanted to point that out because we really are looking at ways that we can 8 9 change the way that we deliver service in a way that I 10 think keeps up with how our customers want to have service 11 delivery. MR. WALKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Pickett. 12 13 The last thing I'll leave with MR. PICKETT: 14 you is please adhere to whatever timelines that you set. 15 I really, really hope that we can get this settled with 16 the timelines that you're putting out there to the tax 17 assessor-collectors and the full-service deputies. We've 18 got to get this settled. 19 MR. WALKER: I can answer that question for you 20 because you weren't here for the first part of our 21 financial review and we got \$21 million as a startup into 22 our fund --23 MR. PICKETT: Twenty-three. 24 MR. WALKER: Twenty-three -- thank you very

2.5

much for the extra two.

1 MR. PICKETT: Two million is nothing to some folks but to me it is still. 2 3 MR. WALKER: So after that money is up, we have 4 to live off the money coming out of that, so it needs to 5 be a high priority to the agency because that's how we 6 live. 7 MR. PICKETT: Correct. We don't want to see 8 you in a supplemental budget next session. 9 MR. WALKER: So we will get straight on that. 10 That's why we're starting next week, and I would 11 anticipate that pretty rapidly we will have that thing in 12 place. 13 MR. PICKETT: Thank you. And thank you to your 14 staff this session. 15 MR. WALKER: Thank you very much for your 16 comments, and thank you for your service to the state. 17 And remember, it is your time to buy next time I'm in 18 town. 19 MR. PICKETT: Yes, sir. 20 MR. WALKER: Okay. Let's start here. I've got 21 several other people that would like to comment before we 22 vote on this, and I'm going to call Mr. Ames up first. 23 He's the tax assessor-collector over in Dallas County. 24 John, before you get started -- and I don't

mean to be rude or anything, but like how much time do you

25

think you need?

MR. AMES: Chairman, I'm elected, so I can take 30 seconds or three hours, you choose.

MR. WALKER: I don't want three hours.

MR. AMES: I just want to make a few comments.

MR. WALKER: I've got like eight comments here, so I don't want to be here all day long listening to comments. We're here to listen to the public, obviously, but we would like to restrict those to maybe three minutes if that's possible. I'm not going to put a stop clock on you if you need a few extra seconds to keep going.

MR. AMES: I'd just like to say my name is John Ames. I'm the Dallas County tax assessor, and also the president to the Tax Assessor-Collector Association of Texas.

So to the board members and audience members, a few of us have had an opportunity to review the study and look at it. We are eager to meet next week with the VTR working group to start the discussions. We understand that the discussions are very important, not only to this agency, because it is your new funding mechanism, but it is extremely important to the county tax offices. As Chairman Pickett stated, the county tax assessors have not had a raise in performing these functions in excess of 20 years, and so obviously, in the last 20 years, as you all

know -- you all run very prosperous businesses

yourselves -- costs have increased. And so it's important
that the county tax assessors in this state have a voice
at this table. Many of them are here today.

2.5

We agree with Chairman Pickett that we need to standardize some of these costs so that can encourage people to do more efficient means of registration, go online, do it by mail. Believe it or not, that \$1 and \$2 and \$3 fee to do those actually discourages people from doing that which causes them to come into our office. As you can see by the study, it costs more to do something in person than it does online or in a grocery store or by mail, so we certainly encourage that.

We also recognize that we have six counties in this state that have the full-service deputy model, and that model is in place in those counties and it's working well for them. We don't want to do anything to discourage that model for those counties; that would be detrimental to their local services for their citizens.

So it's important that we recognize that county tax assessors perform this function as agents for the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles, and therefore, should be compensated appropriately for that, so when you are considering the fee -- what are we calling this, Jeremiah?

MR. KUNTZ: The processing and handling fee.

MR. AMES: -- the processing and handling fee that it be an equal fee that allows this agency to maintain the revenue that they need to run but also allows the tax assessors who perform these duties on your behalf to maintain their offices at the level that the public expects.

Now, because Chairman Pickett mentioned the single sticker, I will say this. Single sticker has been a little difficult in our offices. It started out a little bit rough, it's gotten much better. It's still a problem. We are spending much more time with the public than we have in the past. That hurts efficiencies in the county tax office, so ways to find better efficiencies in registration and titles, ways to find additional revenue sources so that we can help manage the citizens better is very important.

This sync up year with single sticker is going to be to be the ramp-up to next year. Next year is going to be an extremely difficult year with single sticker because the county tax assessors and all the efforts that DMV does with their Two Step program and their media campaign -- and I have to applaud them, they did a great campaign, and if I hear the jingle one more time, I think I'll shoot my foot -- but I will say it really lies on the backs of the county tax offices to educate the citizens about single

sticker. County tax assessors have probably spoken to more Lions Clubs, Rotary Clubs, you name it clubs, trying to get messages about single sticker out than you can imagine, and to this day it amazes me that we have people that come in and say: I have no idea what's this all about. And so it has put a huge burden on our offices and will continue for at least the next 24 months, and so ways to increase efficiencies in other areas is going to be very important for the county assessors.

So we look forward to working with the agency, we look forward to working with the VTR committee next week and the working group, and we know that together we can get this solved so that all parties will be pleased with the results. Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Thank you very much, John.

Appreciate your time. And I know what you're talking about all the phone calls. You wouldn't believe how many people call me and ask me about how do I do this now. I tell them just read the directions.

MR. AMES: Well, the first draft of the information had your cell phone number and then it got removed on the second draft.

(General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: I'm glad. I think everybody that has my cell phone called me.

I think I have next is it Albert Uresti? Did I pronounce that right?

MR. URESTI: Close enough, sir.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. And you are the tax assessor-collector for Bexar County, San Antonio?

MR. URESTI: Yes, sir.

Well, thank you for allowing me to speak here. And we understand that this draft is just a start, however, it has huge implications, and particularly in Bexar County, and a lot of it, as Chairman Pickett mentioned and as John mentioned, is that because we have title service companies in Bexar County and they do a large percentage of our work as far as titles, about 40 percent. Additionally, in El Paso they're doing about 60 percent, and in Austin I guess they're doing about 30 percent.

So we understand that there will probably be increases, however, we're here to -- I guess the rallying cry has been for Austin, they came up with a slogan: No decrease in the increase that's going to be allocated to the tax assessors and to the counties.

Bexar County has a unique business plan that's been in effect for 40 years, and so it's not something that's being tried, some are new and different counties, but in our county it's been there for 40 years and now the

changes that are being proposed -- again, I understand that we're just starting but I also know what the mindset is of DMV -- and what is being proposed is elimination of a convenience fee for these title service companies, and so they need that in order to survive.

In Bexar County we have 21 locations. There's no way that Bexar County can afford to open 21 additional locations, so if there are a lot of restrictions put on them, in essence, what you're going to do is close down 21 locations that are a convenience to the citizens of San Antonio and Bexar County. So we would ask that you consider that.

The other thing I may put out there is there's some company from New York and they're doing registrations here in the State of Texas, and I have talked to DMV about it several times, and they have told me that they are a regulatory agency, not an enforcement agency, but yet that company from New York is doing this and then they want to go and regulate the title service companies which have roots here in Texas, which pay property taxes, which employ people here in our state. So if you're going to do one, you need to do everything.

So again, I do want to thank Representative

Pickett. I do want to thank Jeremiah because he has had

open communications with me and he's been receptive. We

don't always agree, obviously, but I would just ask that 1 2 you really consider helping Bexar County, Austin, Hidalgo, 3 El Paso, and I forget what the other two counties are, 4 Cameron and Wilson. These people rely heavily on the 5 full-service title service companies. 6 Thank you. 7 MR. WALKER: Excuse me, Albert. You have a request also to speak on item 4.C.3. Do you want to just 8 kind of address this now? 9 10 MR. URESTI: This is really what we have come 11 for, and I think we have several companies here. 12 MS. CARAWAY: Albert, the reference to the New 13 York company, that's the online company that's doing the 14 renewals online? 15 MR. URESTI: Yes. And you're having the same 16 problem over there too. Right? 17 MS. CARAWAY: We've had a couple, yes. 18 MR. URESTI: And the other thing I did want to 19 say, this is a unique opportunity for me to get to talk to 20 the board as a whole, so that's the other reason why I talked. 21 22 MR. WALKER: We're always all ears, so come see 23 us anytime. 24 Next I'd like to call -- let me ask a question

Where's

here. I have Stanley Wilson is here to speak.

25

1	Stanley? And you're here to speak on the study? And I
2	have Paul Villarreal, the deputy fee study. And then I
3	have Anthony Lazzari, and you're asking to speak on 4.C.3,
4	but you want to talk on 5.A. I just want to make sure
5	because you have it on paper differently. And I guess
6	it's going to be the same with Steven Palacios? So you
7	want me to just take you off then. Thanks. And I have
8	Michael McDonald, and Mike, you want to speak on, it says
9	4.C, but the same topic. And I have somebody right here,
10	and I don't want to exclude somebody, but let me see,
11	Anthony Lazzari.
12	(General talking and laughter.)
13	MR. WALKER: So let's go with Paul Villarreal
14	first.
15	MR. VILLARREAL: Good morning. It's good to be
16	here. I'm the county tax assessor-collector for Hidalgo
17	County, and it's an honor for me to be here.
18	MR. WALKER: Victor Rodriguez wasn't your ride
19	home, was he?
20	MR. VILLARREAL: I'm supposed to follow him,
21	you know, because he can drive fast, I can go behind him.
22	MR. WALKER: He's always in a hurry.
23	(General laughter.)
24	MR. VILLARREAL: But it's an honor to be here.
25	I've been with the county tax office since 1985, so I'm

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

actually going on about 30 years. I became the tax assessor-collector in 2013, so I've been able to see what's happening here. At that time I was working for the TxDOT regional office in the Pharr Region. So I appreciate the Department of Motor Vehicles, and Jeremiah and his staff have been doing a great job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The only thing I want to let you know a little bit about our county. In our county I have 550,000 registered vehicles and it's always good to work together because I want to bring in funds to the county and to the State of Texas. I think we have the greatest state in the United States so I really appreciate this state. The only thing is like in the Two Step, One Sticker program there, I like it, the only thing is that any time that somebody creates a statute, out of your board I might have two or three of your kids working for me, so I have 550,000 vehicles, so when you create a statute that means it's an automatic workload for my staff. So if I want to compensate them with more work, it's taking us longer just to process that transaction and get that customer out.

I live by the border so my crowd is a little bit rougher sometimes in that area, so what I don't like is that I just put more workload on my staff and I don't compensate them. Every time that you give monies to the general fund, when I go out there they say I don't have

any money. We've been with the county for 30 years and we've been understaffed since then.

At one time I had heard that maybe one time there was going to be maybe a dollar to be for the sole purpose of the tax assessor-collectors, so I don't have to pile up all the work on my employees. Every time I get something new, I have to pile it up on the head cashier, the accountant, the bookkeeper. Now actually I'm doing free work for like the Department of Public Safety. I don't mind doing it, the only thing is that when I want to -- like I said, I might have three of your kids working for me so they're doing more work and I want to compensate them with maybe a little bit more salary but I can't.

The rest of the departments in our county, they themselves, they're always getting good money; my guys, I think they're getting paid about \$26,000 when the other departments are getting \$40-, \$50-, \$60,000. So every time that I've got 550,000 more on the Two Step, these guys are getting 40-something thousand dollars, I'm just getting more work for my staff.

So those are the things that maybe in the future you might want to consider if you put anything for the county to try to separate something for the tax assessor's office to use because I didn't get any more money. There was a mailout that was done, I think 20,000

for renewals went out. Well, if people send me \$72 instead of the 80-some cents, I have to use the paper, the toner, I have to use postage from whatever I have, so I have to go back and ask for more.

I like the process. The only thing is that in the future try to see if you can put something new for the sole purpose of the tax assessors so we can create other positions there and they can go ahead and take care of this process and I don't have to pile up everything on the staff that I've had for years.

And as far as the full-service deputies, I do have one, they're thinking of opening another one, and if we can compensate them maybe by them getting a little bit extra, like Mr. Uresti was saying, that would be great. I know El Paso, Travis County, Bexar County and some other counties, they're trying to help us and the reason they're helping us out is because they don't give us enough staff. My priority is customer service but if I don't have enough staff, now with this adding the Two Step, I have a scofflaw program so I have to check first before I can give you a registration or renewal that you don't have any tickets outstanding for the county. I had approximately about 200,000 tickets out there outstanding, about \$40 million, so I have to make sure I bring in those monies. But my priority is bringing in the renewals for the state

and the county because that's where I get my money, and of course, I get a little money also from the scofflaw. I'm in support of trying to get a little bit more money for our counties and also hopefully the full service they can get a little bit more.

money so they don't have to wait in line for us, I guess that would be their priority. I know that in my area out of 100 percent maybe 30 percent of those people don't have computers like everybody else where they can go online and get it done. So some of those people, they're just set that they're not going to take off from my office unless they see that receipt that says Texas DMV. That's going to make it seem like, well, I already did my part. And some of them, like I said, they might not have computers, there's colonias, there's other areas that are going to be a little bit low income, but the majority of the people out there are coming up with doing it online, and I guess that's good too.

MR. WALKER: Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments, and we'll take all that into consideration.

MR. VILLARREAL: Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Next I'd like to call up Anthony Lazzari.

MR. INGRAM: I have a couple of questions for

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Jeremiah real quick. When they're registering online,

I've never done that -- with dealer plates I don't do a

lot of registrations -- so how do you check the insurance,
the liability?

MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of VTR.

The online system has an interface with what is known as TexasSure which is the insurance database, and so when that VIN is entered in, it actually goes out and looks for a current insurance policy for that vehicle, and if it returns it, you're allowed to proceed with registering online.

MR. INGRAM: And then the second question is that the website where that is done or the page or whatever it is, is it a mobile friendly page? Is it something that looks readable on a mobile?

MR. KUNTZ: I have to check and see. I'm assuming you're referring to what's known as responsive design where it changes everything. I'd have to go back and look. I'm not sure at this point if it's an actual responsive design, but that's something that we could definitely look at.

MR. INGRAM: I would like to look at that, because at this point when you look at, I know on my site we're at about 65 percent using mobile and I just really

think that's where it's going.

MR. KUNTZ: That's something that we can definitely take a look at. There's a lot of technology projects that the agency is taking on right now and that's something that could be looked at and considered.

MR. DUNCAN: Member Ingram, if I may. David Duncan, general counsel.

The contract that is actually procured by the Texas Department of Insurance, we're a participant in that contract for that TexasSure system, is being re-let, and when it's re-let, that could be something that we could explore with the new vendor.

MR. WALKER: Before we move forward, I need to correct the record real quick. As of 9:45, roughly, we lost Board Member Victor Rodriguez. He left, he had another meeting he had to attend this afternoon, so let the record reflect that he's no longer in attendance. Thank you.

Eric Obermier, with our agency here, would like to make a comment.

MR. OBERMIER: Yes. For the record, Eric Obermier, CIO for the DMV.

To address your question, Member Ingram, the website is not currently that mobile friendly so it would require zooming in and scrolling around to do those kinds

of registrations at this point. That is one of the other items that we have on our long list of items to improve within the organization to improve overall customer service as a whole to make more of those services friendly to mobile devices out there. Because we understand that more and more of the customers today are doing those kinds of transactions, even when they're in their house, from a tablet, not necessarily sitting in front of a computer screen.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you.

2.5

MR. WALKER: Mr. Lazzari.

MR. LAZZARI: Just for the record, Anthony Lazzari. I'm president of San Antonio Auto Title.

I just want to kind of reiterate after Albert did come up, I represent the title services in Bexar County, I'll try to represent them. I myself have six stores, there's 21 currently in Bexar County, and just to say that it's very, very important for you all to allow us to continue to operate our business in the capacity that we're able to do it. If you're going to cap us, what's going to end up happening for us is we're going to end up closing down. So the 21 title services that are in Bexar County are going to have to basically shut down, which is about 80 employees.

The other thing that's important to notice --

and it's also in the report -- is that with that shutdown the influx is going to go somewhere, and they're going to go to the tax assessor's office. He doesn't have the capability to do that right now. So we're providing a service to the consumer which we charge them for that and we need to continue to be able to do that.

For myself, for our employees, I didn't just give them a job, I gave them a career, so we provide 401(k), medical. I have two girls that are coming up in June, they've been with the company for 35 years, so San Antonio Auto Title Service has been in existence for 43 years, so the title services for full-service deputies have been connected with the county tax assessor for a very long time. You guys putting caps on this stuff would really, really detriment our business, it would shut us down. So we're asking you guys to take that into consideration.

And aside from that, when you take us out of the equation -- and I understand that some counties do not have full-service deputies so some of the counties might not understand what we provide to counties like Albert's county, Bexar County. You know, we offer them a great service. We provide probably a third or more of their total revenues to them, and for that, they don't have to do much outside of that, but we have to be able to

continue to operate in our capacity.

And also for that, we're providing another convenience for the customer that doesn't have to go to maybe one of the four locations that they have. We've got locations all over town they can go to. So you're really going to detriment the taxpayer because if that happens, we're going to be pushed back, we're going to have to shut down. Overload is going to have to go somewhere, it's going to go to them. They don't have the employees, the capabilities right now to process those transactions.

Anybody have any questions for me?

MR. INGRAM: I have one. So again, I'm not really familiar with this model because it doesn't exist where I am.

MR. LAZZARI: That's why I'm here because not very many tax assessors have it.

MR. INGRAM: Can you give me a list of items that you perform for the tax office?

MR. LAZZARI: We perform the same duties that your county tax assessor does, with some limitations, but we are basically a sub-category, or we're deputized for the county, so we do title transfers, registration stickers, we provide information that people need. A lot of the phone calls, can you imagine how many phone calls? I just have six stores, I'm the biggest one in Bexar

County, but there's 21 of us total, so can you imagine the influx of calls alone that come in that we provide for the taxpayer that calls in, they don't understand what's going on, they don't understand the process, they don't understand the Two Step program, they don't understand all of the application process about how to fill out and what they have to pay for. So those are all things that we also do.

So in answer to your question, we provide almost the exact same services that the county provides, with a few exceptions. We can't do those handicapped placards, those ones that you hang that you see, we can't do those. We can't do visibility plates, but all the other functions we provide, as well as notary service.

MS. CARAWAY: Can you tell me what your charges are?

MR. WALKER: That's exactly my question.

MR. LAZZARI: They're listed in the report. Our charges are \$12 for the registration and everybody is a little different, but you're going to see between \$10 and \$12 on registration and you're going to see between \$25 and \$30 on title transfers.

MS. CARAWAY: I'm sorry. What about other services that you supply, do you charge extra for those as well?

MR. LAZZARI: Well, we have other services. Yes, depending on what they are, if we're doing copies or if we're doing notary and stuff like that, yes, we do charge in addition to that. But those services for the title and registration and the transfer, those are our sole source of income, so with caps on there, we can't operate efficiently on that level. That would be like them coming to you guys and saying, hey, you guys are getting \$10 a transaction at DMV but guess what, we're going to cut you down to \$2, so you lose 80 percent of your revenue. We can't operate like that; we're on the same page, we can't operate like that.

MR. WALKER: So you're \$12.50 on a registration. That does or does not include the \$1.90 tax assessor fee?

MR. LAZZARI: That's a good question. I can't answer that.

MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz. On page 24 there's a table of the current fees that are being charged at the full-service deputy locations. Those fees are in addition to any registration fees that the customer would be required to pay, the base registration fee being \$50.75, if there are any local county fees like the \$10 road and bridge fee, \$1.50 child safety seat fee, there's a \$1 DPS fee and a \$1 automation fee. These fees would be

in addition to all of those, so this is what has been referred to very frequently a convenience fee that is assessed by the full-service deputy.

The \$1.90 that you're referring to that the county is compensated comes out of the \$50.75 registration fee, so when a customer pays \$50.75, \$1.90 goes to the county, \$48.85 goes to the State of Texas and the State Highway Fund, so you peel that off and they retain that \$1.90 at the county level. So when a transaction does occur at a full-service deputy, the full-service deputy would get the convenience fee that they assess, the county would still get the \$1.90 off of the registration transaction.

MR. LAZZARI: Do you have any more questions?

Do you have a bottle of Johnny Walker?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ WALKER: I do but I saved that for Representative Pickett and I later.

(General laughter.)

MR. LAZZARI: Thank you for your time.

MR. WALKER: Thank you very much for coming in.

Next let's call Stanley Wilson with Travis

County. You didn't have to travel as far, Stanley.

MR. WILSON: Good morning. For the record, my name is Stanley Wilson, Travis County associate deputy of revenue management, here representing Bruce Enfant. Bruce

is testifying this morning in front of the legislature.

He had planned to be here but didn't make it, so I had to sign up to speak.

The model that we're using for our full-service deputies is a model that's been in action for about 35 years within Travis County, 35 to 40 years. It's a tried and true method. If you stop that model that we're currently using -- and we've been using it, like I said, for over 30 years. I've been in this position with Travis County now for 23 years myself. I've been responsible for interacting with the full-service deputies.

The cost to us, if we had to shut them down, would be 20 additional staff. My model that I'm using currently by using full-service deputies, I have the lowest number -- we register over one million vehicles in Travis County right now -- I have the lowest amount of staff for the county by using the model that I'm using with the title services. And I'm doing that because, like I said, they're doing about 30 percent of our business, and with them doing 30 percent of that business, that allows me to have less staff that I'm charging to the county. I would have to bring that work back in. Not only am I having to do the staff, I would have to get a place to put those people.

We already did a cost estimate. Just to bring

that work back in-house it would be over a million dollars to the county, not considering what we would pay for space needs to get the people to do that. Plus I'd have to get additional computers from DMV to do that work.

We're happy with what Jeremiah and them have done, I appreciate them for what they're doing, however, the model we have and the people that are using that service, they're using it as a convenience, they're not using it because they can't get to our office, they're using it because we have five locations in Travis County, those other four locations that are there, the title services are more convenient for people to get to than coming to one of my locations. If they come to my location, I have people standing in line at two of my satellite offices right now, I don't have enough staff to accommodate the folks.

You also will notice that most of my walk-in customers at the end of the month, they're there because they don't have credit cards, they're there because they don't have computers, it's not because they can't get online, it's the fact that they don't have the ability to get online. Most of my customers walking in are state workers and they're there because their pay cycle only allows them their money at the end of the month to come I and register their vehicle. And that's why the model that

1	we're using works so well for us because of the
2	convenience of going to other places.
3	One more thing I'd like to point out that's
4	pretty much it. Any questions?
5	MR. WALKER: I've got one question. What
6	percent of your volume is being pushed through the outside
7	deputies?
8	MR. WILSON: Thirty percent.
9	MR. WALKER: Thirty percent?
10	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.
11	MR. WALKER: All right. Thanks.
12	MR. WILSON: Twenty percent of my
13	registrations.
14	MR. WALKER: How many people do you have
15	internally that do the transactions right now?
16	MR. WILSON: Fifty-seven.
17	MR. WALKER: Fifty-seven?
18	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. That's including me,
19	but I don't touch any of that work.
20	MR. WALKER: Thank you very much. Appreciate
21	your time today.
22	MR. INGRAM: Quick question for Jeremiah. The
23	system doing it through internet, they'll take a debit
24	card, or is it just strictly credit cards?
25	MR. KUNTZ: It takes a credit card.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. INGRAM: It takes a credit card.

MR. KUNTZ: Correct.

2.5

MR. INGRAM: A debit card won't work.

MR. KUNTZ: If you have a Visa debit card, then it would work, yes. As long as you have a Visa,

MasterCard, I believe we take American Express and

Discover.

MR. INGRAM: How about like PayPal?

MR. KUNTZ: We do not accept PayPal. I do not believe we have ACH set up currently for online. Those are additional things that could be added by the vendor, but those are not currently available.

MR. INGRAM: Those are massive hindrances to getting more adoption to going online.

MR. KUNTZ: Those are things that the agency could look at. There are some opportunities to do that. I'm not aware of anyone in the state right now that takes PayPal. We have a vendor that has a contract with DIR to provide credit card processing services for all state agencies. If you do an online application and take electronic payments, you're required to use them unless you have an exemption. Currently NICUSA is the vendor that has that contract, and so it takes negotiations with them on the fees and everything else to be able to add additional services.

1	But we do have other payment options that are
2	available for some of our other fees and permits that we
3	issue, and we've been going through a process of
4	evaluating all of those to see about whether or not ACH
5	and other electronic payment means are an option for us.
6	We're going to something that's called Common Checkout
7	with them, and we've been going through a process with all
8	of our applications to move to that Common Checkout.
9	MR. WALKER: I'd like to call now Michael
10	McDonald. Mike, you're speaking on 5.A. Right?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes. I'll try to follow up with
12	what Mr. Uresti and Mr. Lazzari had to say.
13	About our businesses, it's purely a
14	convenience, and no one is forced to come to our
15	businesses.
16	MR. WALKER: Excuse me. Can I get you to state
17	your name for the record and who you're with?
18	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir. Michael McDonald,
19	with Texas Auto Title.
20	MR. WALKER: Texas Auto Title?
21	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. WALKER: And you're where?
23	MR. McDONALD: Bexar County, Texas.
24	MR. WALKER: Okay. Thank you.
25	MR. McDONALD: No one is forced to come to us,

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

we're strictly a convenience. For example, I have an auto dealer that's next door to me, he chooses to go to the county. We're open Saturdays, we're open after hours. People come in, they pull up to the front door. A lady leaving at three o'clock with four kids, it saves her from going downtown. It's a convenience. We get on the phone, we call their insurance company, have them fax their insurance when they need proof of insurance. We follow through with anything they might need to help them.

And like I said, looking at the model study which was \$4.06 for a registration, they're basically cutting our convenience fee in half. We don't operate on a 50 percent profit, not even close. I mean, it would shut us down completely. And I just wanted to let you know that it would be detrimental to our business, I believe the tax collecting in Bexar County, it would be detrimental to it, and it would be a great inconvenience on the people of Bexar County, when we are simply a choice that they choose to come to us, they don't have to.

Our fees are marked up on the wall, they know there's a service fee when they come in. They come every year. You know, you get a registration sticker once a year. They choose to come back, you build a clientele. They're businesses that have been built with our time, our money over years, and it just would be completely

1 detrimental to us if they did cap at what we could charge for a convenience fee. And I conclude at that. 2 3 Are there any questions? 4 MR. WALKER: I have one question. What are you fees for your registration? 5 6 MR. McDONALD: For a registration fee is \$10 7 and for a title transfer is \$29. And I don't think I was one of the title services in the study. 8 9 MR. WALKER: That's why I asked, I looked. 10 Thank you very much. I appreciate your time. MR. McDONALD: You're very welcome. 11 MR. URESTI: Mr. Chairman? 12 13 MR. WALKER: Yes, sir. 14 MR. URESTI: Can I have 30 seconds more, just 15 one quick thing? 16 MR. WALKER: Yes. 17 MR. URESTI: Albert Uresti, Bexar County tax 18 assessor. I know one of the concerns of the DMV Board and 19 20 I believe of DMV is that perhaps excessive charges. 21 tell you, as the Bexar County tax assessor, and I've made 22 this perfectly clear to all the owners of the title 23 service companies, if I catch anyone, any company in Bexar 24 County that is gouging our citizens, I will shut them

They have 24 hours notice is all I have to give

25

them, don't have to check with anybody else, and I'll shut them down. And they will tell you that I have made that perfectly clear. So I just wanted to stress that to you that we do have a strong monitoring system in Bexar County.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

One of the comments that has been told to us is that in the fee study that was done it does not take into consideration outside services, the cost of operating a title service, it is strictly -- and I don't think that this agency was tasked by the legislature or the statute to go out and assess what it costs to run private businesses. The government is not typically in the business of setting private enterprise's fees, I don't want them setting my fees, so what we did was we primarily looked at the cost fee studies that it costs to operate to State of Texas's operations.

MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz.

The study was charged with looking at fullservice deputies, and while this is a private entity, they
are private companies, obviously private companies can
work for profit, the study and the amount that is
reflected in the report, the \$4.06, I believe, that was
referred to, is purely a cost for providing that
transaction, it does not take into consideration profit

margin. So I do want to make sure that we're very clear there, TTI did not go in and make any assessments of any profit margins.

The one thing that I do want to make sure that we're clear, though, is that while these entities are private entities, they are performing a governmental function and they have to contract with a governmental entity. There are many numerous private entities that enter into contracts with government and provide governmental functions, and those entities are still bound by the State of Texas's statutes in how they may operate and do business.

At this point the legislature, through 2202, vested with this board the authority to set the compensation levels that may be retained or charged by a full-service deputy, limited-service deputy and county, and through that you are charged with setting those amounts. Obviously, those amounts are not being set today. This report was merely the first step, as we've referred, to try and assess what the cost of entering into those contracts would be on a per transaction basis. That does not limit your authority or ability to set a fee at that amount, you still have full discretion to set whatever fee you deem is appropriate for providing those services.

1 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Jeremiah. 2 MR. BARNWELL: Call the question. 3 MR. WALKER: Call for the question. Thank you 4 very much. 5 So we have a motion by Mr. Rush, a second by 6 Mr. Barnwell, I think we have exhausted the comment 7 section of it, so all in favor of accepting the report, 8 signify by saying aye. 9 (A chorus of ayes.) 10 MR. WALKER: All opposed, same sign. 11 (No response.) MR. WALKER: Motion carries, the agency will 12 13 accept the study. 14 I'd like to move on real quick to item 6.B.2 15 here, if I could real quick. Mr. Harbeson, could you come 16 forward? 17 I know I'm kind of jumping all over the table 18 today but I'm trying to accommodate the public so that 19 they don't have to sit here all day and wait for us. 20 There's somebody that wants to comment on this, so before we go into executive session, I'm going to let you do this 21 22 so that I can hear their comments and then go into 23 executive session so they can leave if they want to. 24 6.B.2, Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registrations. 25 MR. HARBESON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	Bill Harbeson. I'm the director of the Enforcement
2	Division.
3	If I could ask, were you trying to accommodate
4	Mr. Kieschnick?
5	MR. WALKER: I am.
6	MR. HARBESON: He's actually here to testify on
7	6.B.1, a section of that.
8	MR. WALKER: Can we cover both of these?
9	MR. HARBESON: We can. I think Mr. Avitia, and
10	the person carrying most of the water on 6.B.1 is Mr.
11	Duncan.
12	MR. WALKER: I'm sorry?
13	MR. HARBESON: Mr. Duncan is carrying 6.B.1
14	because it was his staff that actually championed this
15	part of the agenda.
16	MR. WALKER: So Mr. Kieschnick, you're wanting
17	to comment on 6.B.1. Is that correct?
18	MR. KIESCHNICK: (Speaking from audience.)
19	Yes, I am.
20	MR. WALKER: Okay. I'm sorry. I want to
21	correct that.
22	Why don't you let us lay out 6.B.1 first, and
23	then you can make your comments, because I don't know that
24	the board will know exactly what you're going to talk on.
25	MR. DUNCAN: Mr. Chairman, members, David

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Duncan, general counsel.

2.5

As part of our ongoing rule reviews and going through our rules and cleaning them up that we've been working on for over a year, we took on 215 which is obviously a major chapter of great interest to a large portion of our regulated community. What we did on this rule is we met extensively with Bill's staff and Daniel's staff, my folks did for months, and worked on numerous drafts of this rule.

We've shared copies of the rule with TADA,
TIADA, the motor home folks, Gulf States got a copy, and
we did that to prepare them because when you open this
thing up it looks really daunting, it looks like we've
changed lots and lots of stuff, but a lot of it is just
cleanup and reordering, the same thing we did when we
redid the VTR rules. There's a good summary beginning on
page 178 of your board books, and it talks about the
various subchapters and the changes that we made.

I'll leave it to Bill and Daniel to talk about the things that they think are a little more substantive, and one in particular that I believe that the TAC from South Texas is here to comment on.

MR. HARBESON: Yes. Again, my name is Bill Harbeson.

As David has pointed out, we went through the

chapter from start to finish, did a lot of reorganization.

There were some suggested changes in the advertising area that were in large part based on our discussions with TADA. We simplified some rules there and then we added some other some rules where we were having difficulty.

Another particular area, and why Mr. Kieschnick is here from Corpus, during the course of our reviews we had a case that arose down in his area and he got very much involved, to his credit, to try to protect his constituents. We had a dealer that was selling a lot of cars and not transferring titles. And during the legislative session I met with Mr. Kieschnick and his representative, and the question came is what can we do to stop this.

And the problem was the case was well into the administrative process and we were looking at ways to possibly stop it, and looking at the rules, one of the areas was the ability for the agency to order one of these dealers that's having particularly big problems, how can we more quickly stop him from taking advantage of consumers. And the statute provides the agency with the ability to order a cease and desist order, that is, to immediately go in, and more particularly, an emergency cease or ex parte cease and desist where without any sort of hearing but based on an affidavit, the agency could go

in and stop this dealer until a hearing could be held so that more consumers couldn't be taken advantage of.

So with that ability set out in the statute, I talked to the legislator and Mr. Kieschnick and as part of this rule review we've included section where the board will delegate down to the director of the Motor Vehicle Division the ability, upon presentation of evidence by means of an affidavit, to actually order a dealer to cease business until a hearing could be held. This would be an extraordinary remedy that we would seek, and indeed, it would be difficult to obtain such an order except in extraordinary situations such as this where day-in and day-out this dealer was taking advantage by taking people's money, taking people's trade-ins, and not transferring titles.

So Mr. Kieschnick was very involved in trying to help, and again, was faced with the same frustration we were of what can we do in a situation like this. So he asked if he could come up and testify in support of this particular section because of the situation he went through down in Nueces County.

MR. WALKER: So I gather what's happening is that somebody is selling cars and holding the titles and not transferring those titles so that they don't have to go out and repossess them, all they've got to do is go

pick them up?

MR. HARBESON: It's a little worse than that.

He actually was buying cars from other dealers so he had possession of the vehicles. He would then sell the vehicle and not pay the dealer that sold him the cars, the auctions, individuals that sold him the cars, he was keeping the money, and so the titles actually in some of these situations were being held by other dealers who had wholesaled the vehicles to him.

MR. WALKER: And he's not in jail?

MR. HARBESON: No, sir. And that was the frustration, because we also tried to sell this case or present it to the local DA, and we do that in situations like this, and frankly, it's just a matter of not having enough resources to get a DA interested in a case like this.

MR. WALKER: That's stealing.

MR. HARBESON: Yes, sir. It could be characterized as stealing.

MR. WALKER: And the DA doesn't want to prosecute thieves?

MR. HARBESON: I think the difficulty is because the car was placed in his possession and the dealer actually has the ability to make this right by getting the money together, paying off the titleholder,

1 getting the title then transferred. It's just a difficult 2 case to pursue and prove up. 3 MR. WALKER: So how do you tell a thief to quit 4 being a thief and accomplish anything through a cease and 5 desist order? 6 MR. HARBESON: Well, the cease and desist order 7 would in some way stop him from obtaining vehicles, such as going through the auctions because the auctions would 8 9 see the license -- the auctions were looking for an excuse 10 not to sell him the car. It would at least provide law 11 enforcement the ability, the guy on the street to see that he's actually operating with an order over him saying he 12 13 shouldn't be operating. 14 MR. WALKER: And what if he does continue to 15 operate, then where do we go? We have an Enforcement 16 Division, obviously. 17 MR. HARBESON: We then would go through the AG's office or the DA's office to ask for assistance in 18 that situation. 19 20 MR. WALKER: Any more questions for Mr. 21 Harbeson real quick before we go to comments? 22 (No response.) 23 MR. WALKER: Mr. Kieschnick, you can come 24 forward now. State your name and tell us who you're with, 25 please. It is now 10:40.

MR. KIESCHNICK: Yes. I'm Kevin Kieschnick, Nieces County tax assessor collector.

We actually had about, I want to say the number was 141 complaints on this particular dealership, and it started to unravel around the June-August time frame of last year, and we started the process, the administrative process. And the problem is that what this guy did then is he would file appeals and he would be able to continue to sell vehicles through that appeal process, and that's the reason why we're requesting the cease and desist for somebody who is doing this type of transaction.

The problem on the DA side -- and I'm not going to speak for the DA, but this is really what we see with general title fraud as a whole -- we tried to address legislatively and increase the penalty because there's really not much penalty attached to this statutorily for failing to sell a vehicle without a title. I believe the penalty is \$50. That's a slap on the wrist. And so we tried to address that through the legislative process as well, but the problem is that, yes, we can put a lot out there but it doesn't matter if you don't have a DA or your DA doesn't have the staff to go out and pursue these crimes when you've got higher profile crimes such as essentially violent crimes, for example, that are going to take priority over these and getting these to the books

takes quite some time to get somebody to get interested.

Montgomery County is probably the exception to that rule where they actually have a prosecutor and somebody assigned to actually go after title fraud and those sorts of things, but most other counties don't have those kind of resources because they don't have the tax base to support it.

And so what we're really trying to do is stop this in its tracks before it gets further down the road. We can't force anybody to prosecute these things but if we can somehow get a tool in place to where we can get them stopped so they can't purchase vehicles, the dealers will know that that particular dealerships GDN has been revoked or has been a cease and desist, then there's no obligation for them to continue to do business with them.

Primarily what we were seeing was he was purchasing vehicles through a floor plan, not paying those, and then transferring those vehicles off. So guess what we got to do? We get to go through and basically get these vehicles titled through a bonded process because there's still liens out there. You've got two victims now: you've got the victim who purchased the vehicle and you've got the victim who still had prior interest in that vehicle who wasn't paid off. And so it catches us in a rock and a hard place.

Most of these vehicles are \$2-, \$3-, \$4,000 vehicles. These people don't have the income or the ability to hire an attorney to go after him, and it's not lucrative for an attorney to go after him from the standpoint. And this guy is gone by now. He has a history of doing this in the past.

So these are the reasons why we want to go after and these are the people who the cease and desist would be used for, it's not somebody who had a onesie, twosie kind of thing, but somebody who's obviously had issues. And we've also had local media involved and try to get them so people would know not to buy cars from this guy, but it just depends if they paid attention.

MR. WALKER: Who was the damaged party in most of these cases, the consumer that bought the car and lost the car?

MR. KIESCHNICK: It's really three. You've got the State of Texas because this guy also wasn't turning in the sales tax because he wasn't registering the vehicle, so the Department wasn't getting the money they're due. This guy was pocketing that money. You've got the person who probably wasn't paid off or the lienholder who wasn't paid off, and then you've got the party who's got a vehicle. And I had one person who during this time frame for some reason their vehicle got impounded because it

showed a different owner on record because he never transferred the title. And so they've been paying for temporary plates, the 30-day temporary permits, so they're having to continue to shell out that money for those temporary permits while this goes through.

MR. WALKER: So there's no financial interest involved in this either.

MR. KIESCHNICK: They're probably are. I know that Alice Chevrolet, I want to say that they had eight or nine vehicles that he got from them that were not purchased. I know that Sames Crow Ford in Corpus Christi had eight or nine vehicles as well; those are just going to be a loss for them as well. And then you've got the individuals, and then there's the ones that we don't know about that are still just driving unregistered. These are just the numbers we know of.

MR. HARBESON: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately in some of these cases people have traded in cars that were subject to liens, so there's yet another set of people that are being injured by this. Some of these consumers have a car they bought and they traded in a car that was subject to a lien. Of course, when they buy it, the hope is that the dealer is going to be paying off, as part of what they gave them, the outstanding lien on the trade-in, so those are also involved in some of these cases.

1 MR. KIESCHNICK: You hit the nail on the head, 2 but getting somebody to go after them is the hard part. 3 MR. WALKER: So I've got to be careful what I'm 4 going to say now. I'm not so sure a cease and desist 5 order is going to prevent this from happening again in the 6 future because the guy just disappears. 7 MR. KIESCHNICK: Well, it potentially can when you put that cease and desist attached to the GDN because 8 9 now the dealers know that his GDN has been essentially revoked. 10 11 MR. WALKER: Well, like I'm sure that like 12 deputies, for example, we require them to be bonded by the 13 State of Texas in order to prevent a deputy from stealing 14 somebody's title or that kind of thing. So I guess auto 15 dealers are not required to be bonded? 16 MR. HARBESON: Yes, sir. Bill Harbeson. 17 They're required to have a \$25,000 bond to be licensed, 18 and in this particular situation -- and fortunately, this 19 doesn't happen very often that one of these dealers goes 20 in this direction, but that \$25,000 just doesn't last very long in a situation like this. 21 22 MR. WALKER: This guy did have a bond in place? 23 MR. HARBESON: They have to have a bond to be 24 licensed. Yes, sir. 2.5 MR. WALKER: And so have they expended the

bond?

2.5

MR. HARBESON: I don't have any knowledge of that, but I would expect that particularly with the number of vehicles that we have involved in this, I'm sure that bond has been looked to, but I can find that out for you.

MR. WALKER: Maybe would it not be more appropriate to require a larger bond so that a bonding company would take and look at the character of the dealer before they issued the bond? They did that in the trucking industry, they went from a \$10,000 bond to a \$100,000 bond to keep trucking companies from doing exactly this kind of thing.

MR. KIESCHNICK: In my opinion, I think that would help, I think that would help tremendously. But what you need to remember, though, is had we had a cease and desist in effect, what happened was this guy, because he was able to keep his license essentially through the peak period which is February-March-April when tax refunds are coming through, and he was able to stifle the process through appeals, we were still able to get our hands on him during that period because he was very much selling cars during that time period and there wasn't a darn thing we could do to stop it.

MR. WALKER: Does he have brick and mortar?

MR. KIESCHNICK: Yes. And he was also

curbstoning as well, we know that for a fact. We know that he was selling vehicles out of the trunk of his car on the sidewalks and on Sundays.

MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, if I might. Whitney Brewster.

Is the delegation of cease and desist authority going to be completely eliminate title fraud in these sort of instances? The answer is no, but this is one step forward for the agency. It allows us to move more quickly and it also makes it more difficult for the dealer that's committing these egregious acts.

So to your point, no, it's not going to completely eliminate the issue but it will make it more difficult and it will allow us to move more quickly.

MR. INGRAM: So if I may, I have a quick question. So you have to file an affidavit. Who has to file the affidavit, anybody? Can I file an affidavit on my best competitor? I mean, who does the affidavit and what kind of fact checking goes into the affidavit before somebody would issue a cease and desist?

MR. HARBESON: My name is Bill Harbeson again. The affidavit would be filed by staff, and in the cases where we have actually done this, it would be an investigator. And where we've had problems with this is to meet the statutory burden for getting one of these

issued, we have to show immediate and irreparable harm to the public, so it would be like an emergency TRO. So to get it, it's difficult, so we would have to present that to the division director of the DMV. And the statute provides that the board can do this but the board can delegate, and of course, the real problem is are we going to have an immediate and irreparable danger to the public three months from now. These are normally based on our finding that he's turning and burning today, and so therefore, we need to do something today.

The order that's issued, if this passes, by the director, the requirement is that he has an immediate ability to seek a hearing to determine whether it continues in existence during the course of the hearing.

MR. INGRAM: And is that at SOAH, the hearing?

MR. HARBESON: The hearing on whether it remains in effect would be at SOAH. And if the case was already filed and going at SOAH, we would go to SOAH. This is only in those situations prior to us actually invoking SOAH's jurisdiction and having that judge

22 situations where we'd ever even have an opportunity to use

handling the case, so it's a very limited number of

23 this.

MR. SLOVACEK: Bill, what are we asked to do today?

1 MR. HARBESON: Actually, today we're just 2 presenting the package for publication, and this was a 3 rather controversial part of the package in 215, so we 4 wanted to bring this to your attention, and Mr. 5 Kieschnick, again, because he had actually suffered 6 through this situation and when we were discussing tools, 7 as Ms. Brewster suggested, this is just another tool that we're asking to have in our toolbox to use in these 8 9 situations. 10 MR. SLOVACEK: Do we need a motion? 11 MR. WALKER: To post the rule. 12 MR. KIESCHNICK: And we actually were going to 13 file legislation on this but we opted to go the rule route 14 first. If the board so chooses to not go this route, then 15 we'll probably file legislation next session to try to 16 stiffen it up somehow. 17 MR. RUSH: If you increase it to \$100,000 or \$200,000 --18 19

MR. WALKER: Marvin, turn your mic on.

MR. RUSH: Oh, I'm sorry. If you increase it to \$100- or \$200,000, a lot of guys can still get that bond, and what's that going to do if your guy does 25 cars or 30 cars? You know what I mean?

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KIESCHNICK: It's just going to help. mean, it's not going to solve it.

1	MR. RUSH: It's not going to really stop
2	anything. There ought to be some other things we could do
3	to shut it down.
4	MR. KIESCHNICK: Well, that's why we want the
5	cease and desist.
6	MR. RUSH: I understand. But I don't think a
7	\$100- or \$200,000 bond is going to make a difference. A
8	crook is a crook and he's going to figure out a way to get
9	around it.
10	MR. WALKER: Put him in jail.
11	MR. RUSH: I understand. Put him in jail.
12	MR. WALKER: That's where they need to be.
13	MR. KIESCHNICK: I mean, I agree, but since
14	that's not working right now, we've got to come up with a
15	plan B.
16	MR. RUSH: I just think there needs to be some
17	other rules. I don't know what they are. I've been a
18	dealer since I was 16 years old, so I've seen a lot of
19	these things come and go in my lifetime.
20	MR. WALKER: That's only 30 years.
21	MR. RUSH: Let's see, 16 from 77 is what, 59?
22	MR. BARNWELL: I need a calculator.
23	(General laughter.)
24	MR. WALKER: I need a motion. I guess you want

25

to post this for comments.

1	MR. HARBESON: Unless the board had any other
2	questions about the 215 package.
3	MR. WALKER: Well, do you want to do 215 and
4	then we'll do 217 separate?
5	MR. HARBESON: Yes, sir.
6	MR. WALKER: I need a motion.
7	MR. RUSH: Well, what have we agreed on?
8	MR. BARNWELL: It's just for publication.
9	MR. WALKER: We just want to post it for public
10	comments is what we want to do.
11	MR. RUSH: I think there needs to be a lot more
12	bond than that, myself. It depends what cars. Today ten
13	cars is an easy quarter of a million, half a million
14	dollars. I think it's stupid to have a \$25,000, \$50,000
15	bond, because if they're going to be a crook, they're
16	going to be a crook.
17	MR. WALKER: I think Ms. Brewster would like to
18	make a comment about the statutory requirements of
19	bonding.
20	MS. BREWSTER: Whitney Brewster, for the
21	record.
22	The board nor the agency has the authority to
23	set the bond requirement, so that would be a statutory
24	change that would need to occur.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

(General talking.)

1	MR. SLOVACEK: I move we post the item.
2	MR. WALKER: We have a motion to post for
3	public comment. I need a second.
4	MR. BARNWELL: Second.
5	MR. WALKER: We have a second from Mr.
6	Barnwell. Any comments?
7	(No response.)
8	MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying
9	aye.
10	(A chorus of ayes.)
11	MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign.
12	(No response.)
13	MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously.
14	Let's go to Mr. Harbeson, your item 6.B.2, real
15	quick on Chapter 217, please.
16	Mr. Kieschnick, thank you very much for your
17	comments. Appreciate you coming in here today from
18	Corpus.
19	MR. HARBESON: Yes. Item B.2 is a request to
20	publish for public comment amendments to Chapter 217. The
21	board may remember sometime ago we amended Chapter 215
22	that delegated certain order authority down to the
23	division director level, and these were cases that were
24	not tried at SOAH, cases not on the merit, these were
25	agreed orders, dismissals and default orders. Because

1 we've started to generate more cases in the salvage area, 2 we noticed that we hadn't at that time also delegated down 3 orders in the 217 area which handles these salvage 4 disciplinary cases. 5 So this amendment would delegate, as we did in 6 the 215 area, orders that were not tried at SOAH to the 7 division director level, cases that were not on the merits. Again, those were agreed orders, settlements, 8 9 dismissals and default orders. 10 MR. SLOVACEK: I move we post this for public 11 comments. MS. RUSH: Second. 12 13 MR. WALKER: We have a motion by Mr. Slovacek 14 to post Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration, we 15 have a second by Mr. Rush. Any comments? 16 (No response.) 17 MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying 18 aye. 19 (A chorus of ayes.) 20 MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign. 21 (No response.) 22 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. 23 Let's go real quick to Sandra Vice. Are you 24 still here? How long is it going to take you to give your 25 Internal Audit report?

1	MS. VICE: About five minutes.
2	MR. WALKER: Five minutes? You got it. Come
3	on. Let's go to item 4.A.2.
4	MS. VICE: For the record, I'm Sandra Vice,
5	Internal Audit director.
6	And on page 27 of your board book is the
7	internal audit status update that I'll be speaking from.
8	I'm going to present the status of audits in the current
9	audit plan, and then I'm going to give an update on an
10	external audit, and then I'm going to provide the results
11	of the division's first peer review.
12	So starting with the audit plan, we are still
13	completing work on the audit of titling processes and we
14	plan to provide you a report at the next board meeting.
15	We have also started another audit, it is one of the
16	agency's administration of agency's rules and statutes
17	through the tax assessor-collectors. There's a copy of
18	the engagement letter on page 28.
19	MR. WALKER: Excuse me, Sandra, just a second.
20	MS. VICE: Yes, sir.
21	MR. WALKER: I need to let the record reflect
22	that at 10:57 Mr. Slovacek has left the room to take care
23	of some personal business, he'll be right back.
24	MS. VICE: One of the audit objectives is to
25	compile TAC practices for the titling registration work

group, that's been mentioned today, for their consideration in developing a TAC gold standard, and we will provide a report to the board on that audit at the end of August.

I wanted to share with you some good news. We have undergone a quality assurance and improvement program review. On page 30 is the results of that. It's two pieces. One is an internal assessment which our division does, and we have to do that on an annual basis and report to you the results. And the other is an external assessment where we have an independent team of auditors come in and look at us, and that has to be done every three years.

I want to report that on the external assessment we had a team of two experienced auditors from the Department of Family and Protective Services and the Texas Workforce Commission. They were Hector Lozano and Luis Solis, and they have concluded that the Internal Audit Division is complying with Internal Audit Standards and the Texas Internal Auditing Act. They have given us a rating of pass, which I mentioned previously was our goal and is the highest rating that an internal audit division can receive.

Over here I want to recognize and commend my team members, Arby Gonzalez and Derek Miller. If you'll

stand, please. They're smart and they're hardworking and through their efforts we were able to get a pass. I also want to thank the board for your guidance and your advice and your support, and finally, the executive team and DMV staff. They have a desire for continuous improvement which is what auditors like to see, and they are very cooperative. Very happy to report that.

The final item in my update is to let you know that the State Auditor's Office has performed a portion of the financial audit that they do annually on the state's books basically. They do some of that work here at the Department of Motor Vehicles, and for FY 2014 they had one finding. It's included in my update. The agency has already reported that they have implemented the recommendation regarding that finding. The State Auditor's Office plans to come in this year and follow up on that finding.

That concludes my update. I'm available for any questions.

MR. WALKER: Well, I don't have any questions but I do have a comment.

MS. VICE: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: And that is that Board Member Palacios is not here today, and he heads up our Finance and Audit Committee, and so you kind of come directly

under his oversight and supervision. He was quite adamant that I make sure that I make some comments that acknowledge you and your team and that this report came back absolutely glowing in favor that our auditors are, in fact, doing an excellent job and so forth. So thank you very much for the job you do, Sandra, you and your team of guys. We appreciate that. And Mr. Palacios sends his acknowledgment also. He couldn't be here today, he had a meeting with the governor of New Mexico.

Thank you very much.

MR. WALKER: David, since you're sitting right here, under 6.A.1, Chapter 206, Management.

MR. DUNCAN: I can do that.

MR. WALKER: And Jeremiah, why don't you come on up here and we're going to hit both of these, 6.A.1 and 2 and I've got 3 also. And Jimmy, get ready.

MR. DUNCAN: David Duncan, TxDMV general counsel again. Mr. Chairman, thank you, members.

This is an adoption package for a rule review and rework of Chapter 206 which is the board's Management chapter. It contains things like the rules that apply to how your board meetings are held and comment times for people, that sort of thing.

This is an unusual adoption in that we had originally proposed to delete a subchapter of this. While

1 we were starting to do rule reviews on some other 2 chapters, we discovered that there were some cross-3 references to that subchapter, so for now we're going to 4 go ahead and not adopt the repeal of a subchapter. As we 5 go forward and review those other subchapters, we're 6 probably going to look at repealing this later, but for 7 right now the one big change in this one is that we're 8 putting something back in that we had proposed to take 9 out. 10 Other than that, this was all cleanup and 11 reordering of the rule. We repealed some outdated or no 12 longer necessary provisions. We received no comments, 13 which is not surprising, pretty bland rule. And with

longer necessary provisions. We received no comments, which is not surprising, pretty bland rule. And with that, I would request your adoption of the rule changes and the rule review.

MR. WALKER: I'd like to make a motion that we adopt item 6.A.1 for the chapter on Management. I need a second.

MS. CARAWAY: Second.

MR. WALKER: We have a second by Ms. Caraway. Any comments?

(No response.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

1 MR. WALKER: Same sign opposed. 2 (No response.) 3 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. 4 Mr. Slovacek, you're back in the room, I think 5 you can come back up here. Let the record reflect it is 6 11:04 and Mr. Slovacek is back in the room, and now Mr. 7 Barnwell can exit if he wants so that I still have a 8 quorum. MR. BARNWELL: 9 That's okay. 10 MR. WALKER: You're going to wait. 11 MR. BARNWELL: I'm a young pup as you are, by 12 gosh. 13 MR. WALKER: Let's go to 6.A.2, Chapter 217, 14 Jeremiah Kuntz. MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz, 15 16 director of Vehicle Titles and Registration. 17 Before you for final adoption is amendments to 18 Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration, Vehicle 19 Registration Insignia. This, as you are probably aware, 20 will fix an issue that we are anticipating relating to the 21 single sticker program. When new vehicles are sold, they 22 are given a two-year inspection but there's not a 23 requirement for a two-year registration sticker to be 24 applied to those vehicles. That presents a potential

problem for the registration and the inspection to be out

25

1	of sync, and so in order to try and resolve that to
2	prevent any second year registration issues for a
3	consumer, we proposed these rules that would require a
4	two-year registration be issued on a new vehicle to
5	coincide with the two-year inspection that is issued on
6	that vehicle at the same time.
7	We posted those rules, they were published in
8	February. We received one comment from TADA in support of
9	the rule, and we're looking to move forward with final
10	adoption.
11	MR. RUSH: Can I ask a question?
12	MR. KUNTZ: Yes, sir.
13	MR. RUSH: I've always run on a dealer plate,
14	so do I get the two-year sticker? Dealer plate is issued
15	once a year.
16	MR. KUNTZ: Your dealer plate is actually able
17	to be moved around from vehicle to vehicle.
18	MR. RUSH: As long as it's got a sticker on it,
19	you're okay?
20	MR. KUNTZ: Correct. And so it would be
21	unaffected by this.
22	MR. WALKER: So we need a motion to adopt item
23	6.A.2, Chapter 217, Motor Vehicles and Registration, two-
24	year extensions on the registration.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. RUSH: I make the motion.

25

1 MR. WALKER: We have a motion from Mr. Rush. 2 I'll make the second, Mr. Barnwell. I haven't got to do 3 that yet. Any comments? 4 (No response.) 5 MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying 6 aye. 7 (A chorus of ayes.) MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign. 8 9 (No response.) 10 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. 11 Let's go to, while we've got Jeremiah sitting 12 up there, knock out 5.E, please. 13 MR. KUNTZ: Members, before you we have a 14 single license plate for your consideration. This license 15 plate is the World Wildlife Fund redesign, it is a My 16 Plates proposed plate. As you will see, this is the 17 original plate which is the plate that you see on the 18 right-hand side of the board. It is being redesigned with 19 the new logo for the World Wildlife Fund, that's the plate 20 that you see over here on the left. 21 MR. SLOVACEK: Had we already approved the 22 first one? 23 MR. KUNTZ: The first one is in production 24 today, so this is purely a redesign of the existing plate. 25 MR. SLOVACEK: I move we approve it.

1 MR. RUSH: Second. MR. WALKER: We have a motion from Mr. 2 3 Slovacek, we have a second from Mr. Rush to move forward 4 with the redesign of the Wildlife Federation plate. Any 5 comments, any questions? 6 (No response.) 7 MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying 8 aye. 9 (A chorus of ayes.) 10 MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign. 11 (No response.) 12 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. 13 Mr. Archer, let's go to you real quick under 14 item 6.A.3. 15 MR. ARCHER: Members of the Board, for the 16 record, my name is Jimmy Archer. I'm director of the 17 Motor Carrier Division. For the board's consideration, this is 18 19 requested adoption of amendments to the following rules to 20 be published in the Texas Register related to oversize and overweight vehicles. 43 Texas Administrative Code, 21 22 Sections 219.1 through 219.3, Sections 219.11 through 23 219.17, Section 219.30, Sections 219.41 through 219.45, 24 Sections 219.61 through 219.64, Section 219.82 and Section

25

219.124 through 219.126.

The proposed amendments were presented to the board at the February board meeting and the changes to these rules are not substantive in nature but are general cleanup and do the following: they change references from TxDOT to Texas Department of Motor Vehicles where applicable, they change references to Motor Carrier Division to the correct authority under statute, change Texas Transportation Commission references to the Texas DMV Board, change references to the old Chapter 28 to new Chapter 219, and Chapter 18 to Chapter 218, revise terminology to be consistent with other department rules and current practices, as well as add, delete and modify certain definitions, and eliminate redundancy by removing some language from the chapter that is already in the Transportation Code, as well as ensuring that rules are consistent with law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, these rules were presented to you at the February 13 board meeting and published in the Register on March 6, with the comment period ending on April 6, and no comments were received. If the proposed amendments are adopted by the board, staff anticipates publication in the Texas Register on or about June 19, with an effective date of June 28.

I respectively ask that the board approve this adoption.

1	MR. BARNWELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the
2	proposed amendments be approved for publication.
3	MR. WALKER: We have a motion from Mr. Barnwell
4	to accept the proposal.
5	MR. INGRAM: Are we publishing or are we
6	adopting?
7	MR. WALKER: Adopting. I'm sorry. Thank you,
8	Blake. Adopting the rules.
9	We have a motion from Mr. Barnwell. I need a
10	second.
11	MS. CARAWAY: Second.
12	MR. WALKER: We have a second from Ms. Caraway.
13	Any questions or comments?
14	(No response.)
15	MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying
16	aye.
17	(A chorus of ayes.)
18	MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign.
19	(No response.)
20	MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously.
21	Mr. Kuntz, I have a question for you. I think
22	we have covered item 4.C.3. Are there any additional
23	comments that you need to make on the deputy rule fee
24	update? I don't have it that we did that but we've kind
25	of exhausted the topic. I don't know if there's anything

1	else you want to go over.
2	MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz,
3	director of Vehicle Titles and Registration.
4	Item C.3, Deputy fee rule update, just a quick
5	update, as we said earlier, we'll be having a working
6	group meeting on the 3rd and we'll be taking up and
7	considering that. We've already got the agenda set for
8	that and have notified the work group members. That's
9	really the extent. We didn't cover a lot of the topics
10	that we'll be talking about on item 5.A.
11	MR. WALKER: And that committee is starting and
12	they're meeting when, Ms. Caraway? Thursday next week, or
13	Wednesday?
14	MR. KUNTZ: It's the 3rd, and I believe the
15	meeting starts at one o'clock.
16	MR. WALKER: June 3 at 1:00.
17	MR. KUNTZ: From 1:00 to 5:00, I believe is
18	what we've got it scheduled for.
19	MR. WALKER: Okay. Thank you very much.
20	Ms. Flores, do you have anything further to
21	talk about on the headquarters relocation?
22	Linda, are you limping? Is that too much
23	tennis or golf, which is it?
24	MS. FLORES: Zumba.
25	(General laughter.)

MS. FLORES: For the record, Linda Flores, CFO for the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

I've already kind of briefed you about the facility. The only thing I can provide is that we are setting up a meeting between Ms. Brewster and the executive director from Texas Facilities Commission next week to discuss next steps for the acquisition of a building. And as you know, Bull Creek has been sold, we do have a three-year leaseback. We are supposed to provide 12 months' notice if we vacate sooner than that three-year lease.

MR. WALKER: So I have just a real quick question. What do we anticipate a timeline on finding, identifying a piece of property, getting architectural drawings and building a facility? Because in this budget deal it shows that to be completed by 2016, I think, and I don't know that that's possible.

MS. FLORES: Normally the acquisition of land and the construction of a brand new building is in excess of four years, so that is what the discussion is going to be with the executive director next week of Texas

Facilities Commission because there is an alternative option and that is to find a shell building somewhere with an Austin address -- that was one of the requirements that we were given -- and renovate it to our specifications, if

1	you will. And that would be a lot quicker than going out
2	and identifying nine acres, between nine and eleven acres
3	of land that we would need.
4	MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman. Whitney Brewster,
5	for the record.
6	I think we'll know a lot more after we have
7	that meeting with Mr. Hildebrandi.
8	MR. WALKER: When is that meeting?
9	MS. BREWSTER: It's next week.
10	MS. FLORES: June 4.
11	MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.
12	MR. WALKER: Do I need to come here June 3 and
13	4?
14	MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, you're always
15	welcome to attend any meeting you would like, but it is
16	not required. Now that believe that we will get the
17	funding for a new facility, just working out between the
18	two agencies what those next steps are and what kind of
19	timing we're looking at.
20	MR. WALKER: So how much latitude or authority
21	do we have in the actual selection of the location?
22	MS. FLORES: We will have a place at the table
23	to make that decision.
24	MR. WALKER: And I guess the next question

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

which is somewhat relevant, I think, is have we done a

25

1	demographic survey of our employees to say where do most
2	of our people reside?
3	MS. FLORES: We have.
4	MR. WALKER: And where would that be?
5	MS. FLORES: Seventy percent of our staff live
6	up north.
7	MS. BREWSTER: North Austin, 30 percent south.
8	MS. FLORES: And 30 percent are south.
9	MR. WALKER: Nobody central?
10	MS. FLORES: I'm sure there are some central
11	folks around.
12	MR. WALKER: Okay. Well, I'm excited about the
13	prospects of this project going forward.
14	MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. So are we. Thank you.
15	MR. WALKER: And let's bring Ms. Judy Sandberg.
16	MS. SANDBERG: Good morning. For the record,
17	Judy Sandberg, director of the Enterprise Project
18	Management Office.
19	I'm here this morning to provide you an update
20	on selected enterprise projects that are in progress, and
21	later in the agenda we will be presenting an item for your
22	consideration regarding the LACE project.
23	I'm referring to information that is in your
24	briefing book beginning on page 52 and proceeding to page
25	53. I'm happy to report to you that since September 1 we

1 have closed four projects: one regarding active directory 2 in the email password sync which closed in April, single 3 sticker phase 1 closed in March, a portion of our 4 communications program --5 (General talking and laughter.) 6 MR. WALKER: Excuse me, Judy. I'm sorry. 7 That's quite all right. MS. SANDBERG: 8 MR. BARNWELL: Are you okay, Judy? 9 MS. SANDBERG: I think I can carry on. 10 MR. BARNWELL: I know I'm not. MR. WALKER: I was trying to wake him up; he 11 12 was sleeping down there. 13 MS. SANDBERG: Well, I know this is 14 scintillating. 15 Communications project, the headquarters 16 portion of the communications project which was the 17 installation of the new VoIP telephones and cabling has 18 actually been completed, and as you know, temp permits was 19 completed in October. 20 And I am also very pleased to report to you 21 that two of the agency's projects were nominated for Best 22 of Texas Awards, and one of those projects, NMVTIS, was 23 actually selected as the winner for the best application

serving the public, and so agency staff will be attending

those ceremonies soon to receive that award on behalf of

24

25

the entire agency. Temp permit was also nominated for best application serving an agency's business needs.

Moving on, I wanted to let you know that we have started working on single sticker phase 2. We are in the process of hiring a project manager, but learning lessons from our previous project on single sticker, we've already begun working with staff and involving a business analyst to start defining requirements for this second phase of single sticker, and our governance team actually approved the formal project for phase 2. We are waiting for the final results of legislation to determine the impacts that might be involved with our Motor Carrier Division in order to fully know what the requirements for phase 2 may involve, but we are getting started on phase 2.

The WebDealer project is moving along in a green state. We, on May 10 implemented a new phase, the commercial fleet buyers portion, successfully, and we are moving on to the next phase which is salvage which we've already begun work on, gathering requirements, I think we're nearing completion of gathering requirements, so we continue to move forward with WebDealer.

We had a milestone event since we last met, the 100,000th title was actually issued out of WebDealer, and both VTR staff and the change management staff from our

Government and Strategic Communication group have been focusing specifically on how to improve adoption trends.

Earlier our executive director referred to key performance indicators. One of those for VTR is the adoption rate, and they are a little above the target of 5 percent, achieving 5.56 percent.

Moving on to the refactoring of RTS, first speaking about phase 1 which is, as you know, implementing refactored point of sale, the product actually used by the regional service centers and the counties. We are on target in having implemented that over the last couple of weeks, and all of the regional service centers, except Wichita Falls. Wichita Falls will be scheduled in the near future. We are proceeding with one county this weekend. We were scheduled to proceed with four counties.

Lessons that we learned in deploying to the regional service centers made us realize that we needed to really streamline our deployment process, and so the executives discussed this with the project team during the last week and also coordinated with the five counties who were originally included in our pilot phase 1-B that was to deploy this weekend and decided it would be best to proceed with one county, that's Bell County. And Jeremiah coordinated with Bell County and they have been willing to proceed this weekend. We have started deployment

activities already today, and several agency staff, as well as staff from our vendor, Deloitte, will be on site at the four offices at Bell County this weekend and again on Monday to help ensure things proceed smoothly.

After we get through the deployment to Bell County, we'll reassess how that went, what new lessons did we learn, have we further streamlined that deployment to the point to make sure that we provide a good experience for the counties and that we provide as much support as possible for them as they transition to using the new refactored RTS. We'll revisit the rest of the schedule for deployment of the counties and we will share that information with you and with Laura Ryan. We've coordinated closely with her on some of these changes in the schedule, and we'll be sure to keep you informed.

We're also coordinating closely, keeping the county offices informed about our plans. We'll know more after we get through the Bell County deployment this weekend exactly what the impacts to the rest of the schedule will be next week.

Moving on to phase 2 of the refactored RTS project, which is actually moving the data off of the mainframe onto the new server environments, we've reported to you previously that we've experienced some schedule slippage, particularly in the area of testing. We have

seen a delay in the integration testing to be performed by Deloitte. They've encountered some pretty extensive, very challenging and difficult technical issues with the COBOL programming that they need to move off the mainframe.

Staff from our IT division have been very involved in assisting with that, but that has presented a domino effect, delaying not only the completion of the integration testing, that's now had an impact on systems testing, and we also believe -- in fact, Deloitte has communicated to us a suggested revised schedule to extend time persistence testing and postpone the start of user acceptance testing.

So Deloitte still believes that they can meet the August 3 date for moving off of the mainframe. We are concerned that it may be at risk, but we will be having some meetings this week within the agency to really seriously look at that schedule. We've been very focused on the point of sale deployment for counties, and after we get through this weekend we will really focus on this new testing schedule proposed by Deloitte to determine what our options are.

That brings me to the LACE project which, as you know, has been delayed. We've reported that also to you in the past. It's currently been delayed while we go through some procurement processes to get a services

vendor onboard. We're approaching a point where we may be able to award a services contract, but because we're still in those negotiation stages, there's a limited amount of information that I can share about some of the specifics related to that. We do know that we are facing some budget constraints and later on the agenda we actually have an item for your consideration regarding the budget and the contracts associated with the LACE project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That concludes my presentation. Do you have any questions?

Judy, I have one question. MR. INGRAM: LACE, I can't remember, are we actually hiring someone to rewrite LACE or are we just simply moving LACE as is? Because I know it's a different program, different language, different everything.

MS. SANDBERG: We're not actually moving LACE, we are actually looking at trying to find a product that may be partially built that could then be customized, so not necessarily writing it from scratch but definitely replacing the current.

So it's a full replacement, we're MR. INGRAM: just trying to find something in the can that can be modified.

MS. SANDBERG: Yes, that's right.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. INGRAM: Thank you.

2.5

MR. WALKER: Okay. Judy, thank you very, very much, and I don't know that anybody in the room or anybody on the board realizes how much that you, and I think Laura may be watching on TV today, but I know the two of you have really, really been troopers and stepped up to work very hard. I know that you're with Ms. Ryan at least weekly on a conference call as to the status of all these projects.

So Laura, if you're out there watching online,

I want to thank you also for all that you're doing for the

agency for keeping on top of these projects and keeping

them pretty much all in a green light or yellow light

section over there.

And before I take a break here -- which I'm fixing to do right now -- I also want to thank Mr. Slovacek over here. We're coming to the end of our legislative session, and I know that Joe was working very closely with Caroline and his committee over there for all that, and so you'll get to sit back, Joe, and kind of take a little bit of a breather there and leave Caroline alone and let her get back to what she needs to do. So thank you for all you did during the session. I appreciate that.

And with that, I think what we're fixing to do is it is now 11:29, we're fixing to go into a closed

session of the board. This is under Section 551.071 and Section 551.074 of the Government Code.

For those in the audience, I anticipate that we probably are going to be in there for 30 to 45 minutes. They told me about an hour but I think I'm going to probably wing that back somewhat. And I don't think that there's a whole lot of business, we've pretty much conducted most of the business today, I think we have two items left that we will need to come back and talk about after that, but I don't anticipate a whole lot of time.

MS. BREWSTER: Three items.

MR. WALKER: There's three items that we need to finish up, but I don't anticipate. So I thank all of you for attending today, and we're going to go into executive session and we'll be back out in about 45 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 11:29 a.m., the meeting was recessed, to reconvene this same day, Friday, May 29, 2015, following conclusion of the executive session.)

MR. WALKER: It is now approximately 12:33 on May 29, 2015 The Board of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles is now in open session. We want to note for the record that no action was taken in the closed session.

So let's now move on to item number 5.B, Licensing, administration, consumer affairs and

enforcement, LACE. Judy Sandberg, please come forward. Thank you.

MS. SANDBERG: Judy Sandberg.

Members, you have seen the LACE replacement project on the ETMO project tracking reports for several years. You will recall that the project has been delayed several times due to conflicting priorities and other project schedules, however, we are now at the point of soliciting and negotiating contracts for the various components of the project and wish to seek your concurrence with the staff's proposed contracting approach.

We plan to obtain a primary services contractor to perform the upgrade of the system, an independent verification and validation contractor to oversee the primary services provider, just as we have done with RTS refactoring project, and through additional contracts obtain the software necessary to support the upgraded LACE system.

While we cannot get into specifics about the dollars available for the various components of the project, we are aware that the budget for this project may need to increase. Our CFO, Ms. Flores, is aware of this fact and has identified sufficient funds in the automation budget to cover any needed additional expense.

1 The anticipated contracts are all delegated to the executive director for signature under the board's 2 3 existing contract delegation document, since all services 4 and software will be obtained through the existing DIR 5 vendor agreements. However, staff wanted to ensure that 6 the board sees this group of contracts, as they will 7 exceed \$1 million together, and the recent directive from 8 Governor Abbott directs that all state agency contracts in 9 excess of \$1 million should be signed by the board chair 10 or expressly delegated. 11 We are available to answer questions, although 12 we may pause for consultation with general counsel and/or 13 purchasing experts if the answer would reveal any of our

negotiating positions on the various contracts.

MR. WALKER: Do we have a motion?

MR. RUSH: I move to authorize the agency's executive director, or her designee, to select best value vendors for elements of the LACE replacement project funded by the TxDMV automation fund, and to negotiate and execute appropriation contracts with those vendors in consultation with the chairman and the vice chair.

MR. WALKER: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

> MR. INGRAM: Second.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Any questions, comments? MR. WALKER:

1 (No response.) 2 MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying 3 aye. 4 (A chorus of ayes.) 5 MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign. 6 (No response.) 7 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. Let's go to item 5.C, Linda Flores on the Waco 8 9 facility, I believe. MS. FLORES: Linda Flores, CFO for the 10 11 Department of Motor Vehicles. Good afternoon 12 I'm here before you to request board approval 13 to enter into a second five-year term lease at the Waco 14 Regional Service Center. This regional service center 15 houses approximately eight FTEs with a square footage of 16 2,300 square feet. The property is located at 2203 Austin 17 Avenue in Waco, Texas. 18 The rent is expected to start out at 19 approximately \$39,000 in the upcoming fiscal year, and by 20 the end of the five-year term it's supposed to go up to about \$44,000. A CTI is automatically built into the 21 22 lease term and we estimate that CTI to be approximately 23 \$1,200 per year. Consumer price index. The lease payment 24 is not inclusive of utilities, janitorial general

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

maintenance which is handled separately.

25

1	I'm available to answer any questions.
2	MR. WALKER: What's the total value of the
3	contract?
4	MS. FLORES: \$209.131.
5	MR. WALKER: So that's why it takes board
6	action then.
7	MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.
8	MR. WALKER: Do I have a motion to enter into
9	the lease contract in Waco?
10	MR. BARNWELL: I move to authorize the agency's
11	executive director, or her designee, to negotiate and
12	execute, in conjunction with the Texas Facilities
13	Commission, a contract renewal for the Waco Regional
14	Service Center lease for an additional five-year term,
15	effective September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2020. In
16	addition, I also move to authorize the agency's executive
17	director to approve any amendments to that contract with
18	the approval of the chairman.
19	MR. WALKER: We have a motion. Do we have a
20	second?
21	MR. RUSH: Second.
22	MR. WALKER: We have a second by Mr. Rush. Any
23	comments or questions?
24	(No response.)
25	MR. INGRAM: I have just one comment. The

1 square footage again? 2 2,300 square feet. MS. FLORES: 3 MR. INGRAM: That was my only question. 4 MR. WALKER: All in favor signify by saying 5 aye. 6 (A chorus of ayes.) 7 MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign. 8 (No response.) 9 MR. WALKER: Motion carries unanimously. Let's go to item 5.D, security services 10 11 contract, regional service centers. MS. FLORES: For the record, Linda Flores, CFO 12 13 for the agency. With me is Jeremiah Kuntz, director of 14 VTR, and Eric Obermier, the chief information officer for the agency. This is a collaborative effort between the 15 16 three areas, and we're requesting authority for the 17 agency's executive director, or her designee, to determine 18 best value vendor to install security systems in all 16 19 regional service centers. 20 Staff has been in the process of visiting each 21 regional service for the last two weeks. Today is the 22 last day where the purchasing staff will come back to 23 Austin, they've been visiting each center to perform site 24 visits of the physical locations and what's going to be

required for the potential bidders to include in their

25

bid.

This is a capital item that was appropriated to the agency during the current biennium and it will provide cameras, badge entry, emergency door releases, 24-hour security monitoring, as well as courier services for Dallas, San Antonio, Fort Worth and Houston and El Paso.

And we're available to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. WALKER: I have a question before we put it up for vote. I heard you say vendors, so I'm going to assume that we're going to bid each location individually, or are we bidding it as one group?

MS. FLORES: It is one group, and the potential bidders will be required to make all of those site visits if they want to be included in that bid award, or considered in that bid.

MR. WALKER: So it has to be somebody capable for doing work in multiple cities?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: And did we look at the alternative of, say, bid it in Houston and bid it in Dallas and bid it in Austin individually?

MS. FLORES: We did not.

MR. WALKER: Would that not be a more prudent inexpensive way to do it where we have local vendors do

1 the work instead of a big chain that travels around? 2 MS. FLORES: I'm going to ask David Chambers, 3 the director of Purchasing, to come to the table. 4 MR. CHAMBERS: For the record, my name is David 5 Chambers, and I'm the director of Purchasing. 6 The reason we did not consider using multiple 7 bidding sources is to ensure that we had consistent 8 equipment in all locations so we could have consecutive 9 monitoring in all the facilities. MR. WALKER: Well, I don't think the staff 10 11 would like my recommendation, but my recommendation would be that before we make a determination on this, we 12 13 probably ought to go back and look at individual bids for 14 the locations separately and see how that fares price-15 wise. I mean, I can buy a Peterbilt truck in Dallas from 16 a dealer there and get one in San Antonio. 17 MR. RUSH: No, you can't, same owner. 18 MR. WALKER: I'm saying I'm going to get the 19 same quality of product at both places is what I'm trying 20 to say. MR. RUSH: But you don't get the same price 21 22 because of price fixing. 23 (General laughter.) 24 MR. WALKER: Let's take a break for just one 25 second.

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. WALKER: So we're back on the record here. So let's go back and just kind of clarify, Linda, if we could, on the vendor selection process, would you please?

MS. FLORES: Yes, sir. So we have multiple vendors who are performing site visits and they're just taking a look at the physical locations to determine what's going to be needed with the way of the cabling, the electrical boxes, to install the specified equipment that we have requested. Once they do that, they complete that process, they're going to go back to their offices and put together their bid. They will submit those bids to the agency and we'll evaluate those bids and determine what is the best value for the State of Texas with regards to the installation of this equipment. It could be one vendor, it could be multiple vendors.

So what we're asking is the board to authorize the executive director to negotiate and execute, in consultation with the board chair, the appropriate contract for these services within the budget amount that the agency has been appropriated.

MR. WALKER: So I'm onboard right now, now that we've discussed that it is multiple vendors and multiple locations.

So do we have a motion to allow the executive

1	director to have this authority?
2	MR. RUSH: I make a motion.
3	MR. WALKER: Somebody has the script. Luanne
4	does.
5	MS. CARAWAY: I do. I move to authorize the
6	agency's executive director, or her designee, to select
7	the best value vendor or vendors to provide security
8	systems and services for the 16 TxDMV regional service
9	centers, and to negotiate and execute, in consultation
10	with the board chairman, appropriate contracts to obtain
11	those services within the budget amounts previously
12	approved by the board.
13	MR. WALKER: We have a motion by Ms. Caraway.
14	Do we have a second?
15	MR. BARNWELL: Second.
16	MR. WALKER: We have a second by Mr. Barnwell.
17	Any further comments or questions?
18	(No response.)
19	MR. WALKER: I have a question. This is for
20	all 16 facilities?
21	MS. FLORES: Yes, sir.
22	MR. WALKER: We did not put in a system when we
23	did Houston here recently?
24	MS. FLORES: What we put in was just basic
25	cabling in anticipation of the monitoring and security

1	system.
2	MR. WALKER: But we did put in the card key
3	system and everything in Houston, did we not?
4	MS. FLORES: That's not in there yet.
5	MR. WALKER: It's not in there yet. Okay.
6	MS. FLORES: We have real keys.
7	MR. WALKER: I knew that we had concern that we
8	were going to get that done; I thought it had gotten done.
9	All in favor signify by saying aye.
10	(A chorus of ayes.)
11	MR. WALKER: All opposed same sign.
12	(No response.)
13	MR. WALKER: Motion carries.
14	And I think that that pretty much concludes
15	everything on today's agenda, and if that's the case, I
16	will take a motion.
17	MR. INGRAM: So moved.
18	MR. RUSH: Second.
19	MR. WALKER: Multiples. Nobody is enthusiastic
20	about that, are they? So we have a motion by Mr. Blake
21	Ingram and I have a second by Mr. Rush.
22	All in favor signify by saying aye.
23	(A chorus of ayes.)
24	MR. WALKER: Thank you very much. Appreciate
25	your time.

1 (Whereupon, at 12:49 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

3

CERTIFICATE

MEETING OF: TxDMV Board

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: May 29, 2015

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 155, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

/s/ Nancy H. King 06/08/2015

On the Record Reporting 3636 Executive Center Dr., G22 Austin, Texas 78731